



Voters' Pamphlet

Oregon General Election
November 6, 2018

Certificate of Correctness

I, Dennis Richardson, Secretary of State of the State of Oregon, do hereby certify that this guide has been correctly prepared in accordance with the law in order to assist electors in voting at the General Election to be held throughout the State on November 6, 2018. Witness my hand and the Seal of the State of Oregon in Salem, Oregon, this 24th day of September, 2018.

Dennis Richardson
Oregon Secretary of State

vote!

Oregon votes by mail. Ballots will be mailed to registered voters by October 17.

DENNIS RICHARDSON
SECRETARY OF STATE

LESLIE CUMMINGS, PhD
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE



ELECTIONS DIVISION
STEPHEN N. TROUT
DIRECTOR
255 CAPITOL ST NE, SUITE 501
SALEM, OREGON 97310
(503) 986-1518

Dear Oregon Voter,

This **November 6, 2018** General Election marks 20 years since Oregon's voters chose to conduct all elections through the mail. Citizens placed Measure 60 on the ballot through the initiative process and then overwhelmingly approved it at the 1998 General Election. Over these past 20 years, we have realized the benefits of increased access and ease of access to the ballot, higher voter turnout, and improved election security because of our first in the nation vote-by-mail system. Today, those benefits continue as over 2.7 million Oregonians will receive a ballot in the mail beginning on **October 17**.

I would like to congratulate the voters of Grant County who had the highest voter turnout at the Primary Election this past May. Which county will have the highest turnout in the upcoming General Election? My goal as Secretary of State is to maximize voter participation and access while ensuring election integrity, so that our democracy can be strong and vibrant. You can have confidence that our elections are secure and accurate and that every vote counts. I encourage you to study the issues, make your voice heard, and participate in all elections. You can find out if you are registered to vote or update your registration, like changing your address or political party, at www.oregonvotes.gov/myvote.

If you are not registered to vote, you must register by **October 16** to be eligible to vote in the November 6, 2018 General Election. You can register online at www.oregonvotes.gov/register or fill out and return the form in this pamphlet.

Beginning October 17, ballots will be mailed from every county elections office. After you have filled out your ballot, be sure it is physically received, not just postmarked, by your county elections office by 8:00 pm on November 6. Remember, postmarks do not count. You can return your ballot through the mail, take it to your local elections office, or drop it in one of the many drop boxes throughout the state. To track your ballot or to find your nearest drop box, visit www.oregonvotes.gov/myvote.


If you have questions about voter registration, filling out your ballot, or getting a replacement ballot, please call our toll-free hotline at 1-866-673-8683 or call your county election official.

As your Secretary of State, I encourage every eligible Oregonian to register and vote in this and every election. I am committed to making voting easy, convenient, and secure.

If you have any questions, please give us a call.

Sincerely,

Dennis Richardson
Oregon Secretary of State



Voters' Pamphlet

General Election
November 6, 2018





Table of Contents

Candidates	
List of Candidates	22
Partisan Candidates	24
Nonpartisan Candidates	38
Political Party Statements	
Constitution Party	14
Democratic Party	15
Independent Party	16
Libertarian Party	17
Pacific Green Party	18
Progressive Party	19
Republican Party	20
Working Families Party	21
Measures	
Measure 102	46
Measure 103	55
Measure 104	79
Measure 105	100
Measure 106	118
Measure 22-174	140
Measure 22-176	141
Voting Information	
County Elections Officials	4
Dates to Remember	5
Vote by Mail	7
Voter Registration Information	8
Oregon Voter Bill of Rights	12
Ballot Instructions	23
Voting & Ballot Prohibitions	142
Additional Information Pages	
General Information	6
Election Security	6
Voters with Disabilities	10
Party, Candidate & Measure Information	13
Election Results	30
ORESTAR	35
Index	
Index of Candidates	143



For questions about:

- registering to vote
- updating your registration
- absentee ballots
- elections and voting
- completing and returning your ballot
- signature requirements
- replacement ballots

Contact your county elections official or the State Elections Division.

for more information about voting in Oregon

 **oregonvotes.gov**



1 866 673 8683

se habla español

TTY 1 800 735 2900

for the hearing impaired

Linn

Steve Druckenmiller
County Clerk
300 SW 4th Ave
Albany, OR 97321

541-967-3831
TTY 1-800-735-2900
fax 541-926-5109
sdruckenmiller@co.linn.or.us
www.co.linn.or.us

vote!

Dates to Remember



→ **Tuesday, October 16**

Last day to register to vote or change political party affiliation for this election.

→ **Wednesday, October 17**


First day for counties to mail ballots



→ **Tuesday, November 6**

Election Day

Ballots must be received by 8 pm



→ **oregonvotes.gov/myvote**

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

Voters' Pamphlet

This is your official State Voters' Pamphlet for the **November 6, 2018, General Election**. It is designed to assist you in participating in the General Election. This pamphlet also includes instructions for marking your ballot, information for voters with disabilities and domestic violence survivors, and other information to assist you in the voting process.

The Secretary of State has compiled the voters' pamphlet 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. It can also be viewed online at www.oregonvotes.gov.

Cover Photo

Oregon Pioneer, State Capitol Building
Gary Halvorson, Photographer, Oregon State Archives

County Voters' Pamphlet

A county clerk may prepare and distribute a county voters' pamphlet. It includes information about candidates and measures from local governments located within the county.

To save on mailing and production costs a county that prepares a voters' pamphlet may insert the pamphlet into the center of the state voters' pamphlet for distribution. The county insert uses a numbering system that is different from the standard page numbering used in the state portion and each page is clearly marked with a color or shaded bar on the outside edge.

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.

How to File a Complaint

Any registered voter may file a written complaint alleging that a violation of an election law has occurred. The complaint should provide evidence showing a violation. The complaint must be signed by the elector. Anonymous complaints will not be accepted. The complaint should be sent to:

Secretary of State, Elections Division
255 Capitol St NE, Suite 501
Salem, OR 97310

Election Security

Ensuring the Accuracy of Your Vote

Oregon elections are secure. They're secure, not because there aren't any threats, but because we have detailed processes and procedures in place that are continuously evaluated to identify improvements and to develop contingency plans, ensuring our systems and our votes are secure.

Some security measures you may be more familiar with than others. For example the signature on your ballot return envelope is compared to the signatures in your voter registration record and your ballot is only counted if the signatures match. Another security feature is that all elections in Oregon must be conducted using a paper ballot.

Other security features which you may not be as familiar with include:

- Every county elections office files a security plan with the Secretary of State every year that details the tools and processes they use to secure elections in their county.
- Each day a copy of the voter registration database is backed up and saved to ensure accurate information is preserved should a bad actor gain access.
- All voting systems (machines and programs) used to count ballots in Oregon have been certified by a federally accredited voting system test laboratory and have been further analyzed to ensure the system is secure before the Secretary of State approved of their use.
- All ballots are counted in secure rooms at each of Oregon's 36 county election offices. Security cameras are in place to record 24 hours a day. No voting systems are connected to the internet.
- Prior to any ballots being counted, counties test voting systems for logic and accuracy. This testing entails marking test ballots and running them through the vote counting machines to ensure results produced by the voting machines match how the test ballots were marked. This same process is followed after the election to confirm there was no change to the programming.
- Finally, after the election and prior to certification of the results, an audit of randomly sampled ballots is conducted. This audit requires human beings to review every ballot in the random sample to prove that results produced by the vote counting machines accurately reflect the marks made by voters.

The US Department of Homeland Security and the FBI have confirmed that no vote tally systems in Oregon, or anywhere else in the US have been hacked. You can have confidence that your ballot will be counted as you mark it and that there will be no tampering with the ballot at any step in the election process. Voting in Oregon has never been more secure or more accurate.

Vote by Mail Frequently Asked Questions

How do I vote in Oregon?

In Oregon, we vote by mail. Your county elections office will automatically mail you a ballot packet for every election that you are eligible to vote in. Inside the packet, you will find the ballot and instructions on how to complete and return the ballot. [Follow the instructions!](#) For this election your ballot packet will automatically be mailed to you between **October 17** and **October 23, 2018**.

Do I need to update my address if I have moved?

Ballots are not forwardable. If you were registered to vote by **October 16** but now have a different address, call your county elections office for instructions on how to update your registration and receive a ballot.

Can I vote in person at a polling place?

There are no polling places in Oregon. Instead you can complete your ballot anywhere you choose. If you are uncomfortable voting your ballot at home or elsewhere, there are privacy booths available at your county elections office. Call your county elections office for further information.

What if my ballot doesn't come?

As a registered voter, you can check the status of your ballot at www.oregonvotes.gov/myvote. For this election if you have not received your ballot packet by **October 26**, call your county elections office.

How do I return my ballot?

You can return your ballot by mail or return it to any county elections office or an official drop box. You can find the nearest drop box, along with a map of how to get there, at www.oregonvotes.gov/myvote or by contacting your county elections office.

Remember! If returning your ballot by mail, you must attach a single "Forever" first-class stamp to your ballot return envelope before mailing it back.

When do I have to return my ballot by?

Your voted ballot must be received in any county elections office or official drop box by **8 pm, Tuesday, November 6**. **Postmarks do not count!** All county elections offices are open election day from **7 am to 8 pm**.

How do I know if my voted ballot has been received?

You can track the status of your ballot online at www.oregonvotes.gov/myvote.

Will my vote count if I forget to return my ballot in the secrecy envelope or sleeve?

The county elections office will maintain the privacy of your ballot if you forget the optional secrecy envelope or sleeve and your ballot will still count.

Is my vote really kept secret?

Yes, how you voted is secret, but whether or not you returned your ballot is public record. To ensure your vote remains a secret, your ballot is separated from the return identification envelope before it is reviewed. County elections officials only review and count your ballot after verifying your signature.

What if I forget to sign the return envelope?

Contact your county elections office as soon as possible. If they find an unsigned ballot they will contact you.

Can the public watch the election process?

Yes! You can watch all steps of the process. Contact your county elections official to make arrangements.

When will election results be known?

Initial results are released at **8 pm** election night and will continue to be updated through election night. Final certified results will be available 30 days after the election.

Replacement Ballot Information

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.

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); or
- 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 **1-866-673-8683** 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.

Am I qualified to register to vote in Oregon?

You are qualified to register to vote in Oregon if you can answer yes to the following questions:

- Are you a resident of Oregon?
- Are you a US citizen?
- Are you at least 16 years of age?

If you are not yet 18 years of age, you will not receive a ballot until an election occurs on or after your 18th birthday.

How do I register to vote in Oregon?

To register to vote you can complete a registration card or use the online registration process to provide your county elections official your full legal name, home address, date of birth, signature, and valid identification.

The online voter registration process is available at www.oregonvotes.gov.

Registration cards are also available at any county elections office, the Secretary of State's Office, and some state agencies such as the DMV.

What identification do I provide?

You must provide your valid Oregon Driver's License, Permit or ID number. A suspended Driver's License is valid, a revoked Driver's License is not valid.

If you do not have valid Oregon ID, provide the last four digits of your Social Security number.

If you do not have a valid Oregon ID or Social Security number you can find a list of acceptable alternative identification online at www.oregonvotes.gov.

Address Confidentiality Program

Individuals whose personal or family safety may be in danger if their home address is available as a public record may register to vote with confidentiality protections by applying for the Address Confidentiality Program (ACP).

The ACP is a free mail forwarding service. It helps survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking or human trafficking shield their physical address. Program participants are provided with a substitute address to use instead of their real address. To be eligible for the ACP you must live in Oregon, **and**

- be over 18 years old, **and**
- be a victim of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, or human trafficking, **and**
- have recently relocated (or are about to relocate) to an address unknown to the perpetrator(s) or any government agencies.

Parents or guardians may apply on behalf of incapacitated adults and minor children who are otherwise eligible for the ACP.

Participation in the ACP by itself does not guarantee anyone's safety. ACP staff do not provide threat-assessment or safety-planning and are not allowed to offer legal advice.

To apply to the Address Confidentiality Program, you must work with a victim advocate who has been designated as an Application Assistant by the Attorney General. For more information or to find an Application Assistant near you visit <https://www.doj.state.or.us/crime-victims/victims-services/address-confidentiality-program-acp/> or call **888-559-9090**.

What is the deadline to register to vote for this election?

To vote in the **November 6, 2018**, General Election, your completed voter registration card must be:

- postmarked by Tuesday, **October 16**; or
- delivered to a county elections office or voter registration agency (e.g., DMV) by Tuesday, **October 16**.

If you register to vote online, your registration must be submitted by 11:59 pm on Tuesday, **October 16**.

When do I need to update my voter registration?

You should update your registration if you change your home address, change your mailing address, change your name, change your signature, want to change or select a political party, or will be away from home on election day.

You can provide the new information online at www.oregonvotes.gov or by completing and returning a voter registration card to your county elections official.

Do I have to register with a political party to vote?

No you do not. However, by joining a political party you are able to select the party's candidates either by voting in a party's primary election or by participating in other nomination processes.

If you do not select a political party you will still receive a ballot for every election you are entitled to vote at. However, the ballot you receive for a primary election will not include any political party candidates.



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 16 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 _____ 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/ID or a SSN.
 I have attached a copy of **acceptable identification.**

political party

- Not a member of a party
- 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 imprisoned 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) _____



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 homes 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

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 from your county elections office by phone.

→ Easy Voting Guide

Available in print and accessible HTML at easyvotingguide.org.

Additional Resources

→ Large print voter registration card

→ 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.

Who can provide assistance to a voter?

- A County Voting Assistance Team
 - A Facility Voting Assistance Team
 - Someone chosen by the voter
-

Who cannot provide assistance to a voter?

- 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

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 a secret vote. You do not have to tell anyone how you voted.
- **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 get a "provisional ballot," even if you are told you are not registered to vote.
- **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 get a new ballot if you make a mistake.
- **You have the right** to vote or cast your ballot if you are in line by 8pm on Election Day.
- **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 know if you are registered to vote.
- **You have the right** to vote "yes" or "no" on any issue on your ballot.
- **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 leave some choices blank on your ballot. The choices you do mark will still count.
- **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 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 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 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 8683

se habla español

TTY 1 800 735 2900

for the hearing impaired

Political Party Statements

At the General Election, a statewide political party may file for inclusion in the state voters' pamphlet, a statement that argues for the success of its principles and the election of its candidates on a statewide or county basis or opposes the principles and candidates of other political parties or organizations on a statewide or county basis. Included in this pamphlet are statements from all statewide political parties. They appear in alphabetical order.

Candidates

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 the candidates will appear on the ballot.

The alphabet for the **2018 General Election** is:

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

Candidate statements included in the pamphlet are separated by office type and position and are further arranged in the same random order in which the names of candidates will be printed on the ballot.

Statements are arranged in the following manner:

- partisan candidates by position in ballot order
- nonpartisan candidates by position in ballot order

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

Measures are proposed changes to the Oregon Constitution or to state laws. For the measure in this voters' pamphlet you will find the following information:

1. the ballot title;
2. the estimate of financial impact;
3. the complete text of the proposed measure;
4. the explanatory statement; and
5. arguments filed by proponents and opponents of the measure.

Ballot Title

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

Estimate of Financial Impact

The estimate of financial impact for each measure is 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. Working from information provided by state agencies and comments provided in a public hearing process, the committee estimates only the direct impact on state and local governments. The estimate assumes that the measure will be implemented as stated and expresses annual costs in ranges wherever it can be calculated accurately.

The committee also consults with the Legislative Revenue Office to determine whether the measure may have an impact on the overall state economy, should appropriate analysis be available. Further explanation of the estimate can be added by the committee in a second statement if they view it to be necessary. Only the procedures used by the committee, not the content of the statement, can be challenged in the Oregon Supreme Court.

Complete Text of the Measure

This provides you with the actual changes that will be made by the measures to the Oregon Constitution or to state laws.

Explanatory Statement

The explanatory statement is an impartial statement explaining the measure. Explanatory statements are 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.

Measure Arguments

Any person or organization may file arguments in favor of, or in opposition to, a measure on the ballot 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.

Disclaimer

Statements and arguments are printed as submitted. The state does not verify the accuracy of information submitted by a candidate, political party, assembly of electors, or person supporting or opposing a measure. 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. Other errors in punctuation, grammar, or syntax are not corrected.

Constitution Party

Statement of the Constitution Party of Oregon to the Voters

All our nominees are pledged to defend the following three Principles, (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.

We are pleased to offer you a true choice in the candidates we present to you. No longer do you need to vote for the incrementally lesser of two evils. When you see one of our candidates on your ballot, you can know that they stand for what is right, not what is politically expedient. They are all committed to restoring the Constitutional Republic that our Founders gave us. Our candidates are not backed by monied interests. In most cases you will see them on the ballot only, not here in the voter's pamphlet, which costs each candidate a significant amount of money.

We have nominated for you the following members of our party:

Aaron Auer for Governor
Michael Marsh for US Congress, 3rd District
Ray Biggs for State Senate, 16th District

We have joined the Republicans in nominating the following signers of our pledge:

Art Robinson for US Congress, 4th District
Scott Rohter for State Senate, 4th District

The Constitution Party of Oregon maintains that our true heritage is freedom.

God-fearing men founded our nation. They wanted freedom from human tyranny. They wanted to obey the dictates of their consciences in accordance with the Bible. Oregon's history as a state is rooted in the desire of Native Americans to have the truth of the Book of Heaven, as they called the Bible. There are memorials on the capitol grounds of Oregon reminding us of the part that missionaries had in the formation of our state's civil and educational institutions. We know that the first missionary to Oregon, Jason Lee, was the true Father of American Oregon, assisted in the drafting of our state constitution and founded Willamette University that began as a mission school for Native Americans.

Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed.

Oregon Constitution, Article I, Section 1, "... all men, when they form a social compact are equal in right: that all power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded upon their authority, and instituted for their peace, safety, and happiness..."

Our rights are inalienable, coming from the hand of the Creator.

Our system of laws is based on the Judeo-Christian moral code.

The powers of the federal government in our Republic are restricted to those specifically granted in the Constitution of the United States.

Vote your conscience when electing new guardians for your future peace, safety and happiness. Voting for the lesser of two evils is still voting for evil and will never recover our heritage. We are raising a standard around which the wise and honest can rally, believing that the events of history are in the hands of God.

Remember, if you don't honor them with your vote, the candidates you really want can never win. **DON'T vote out of fear or greed!**

If you have Internet access, study our platform and other documents on line at: www.constitutionpartyoregon.com

or contact:

Chairman Jack Brown
1252 Redwood Avenue PMB 68
Grants Pass OR 97526
(541)659-4313

Vice-Chairman Bob Ekstrom
51163 Bankston Road
Scappoose OR 97056
(503)317-8274

(This information furnished by Constitution Party of Oregon.)

Democratic Party

The Democratic Party of Oregon is nearly one million strong, fighting for progress and helping elect Democrats from all corners of our state.

There are several core beliefs that tie our party together:

Democrats believe that we're greater together than we are on our own—that **this country succeeds when everyone gets a fair shot, everyone does their fair share, and everyone plays by the same rules**. Our party is focused on building an economy that lifts up all Americans, not just those at the top.

That's why Democrats are working to make progress on issues like **health care, good jobs for Oregonians, equal pay, education, and clean energy**.

In Oregon, Democrats have led the nation on **resisting the Trump agenda**, refusing to cede to his dark vision for our nation's future.

We've passed legislation to support working families by **increasing the minimum wage** and providing **paid sick leave**, we've been a trailblazer on expanding access to the ballot by implementing **Oregon Motor Voter** and **online voter registration**, and we continue to **fight for all Oregonians**, regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, class, or physical ability.

Oregon Democrats Stand For:

- A right to health care for all
- Quality public schools
- Protection for labor unions and workers' rights
- Action to respond to climate change
- Humane immigration reform policies
- Racial and gender equality
- Protecting Social Security and expanding access to pensions
- Growing good jobs for Oregonians
- Criminal justice reform
- LGBTQ+ rights
- Gun safety measures
- Campaign finance reform
- Voting rights for all
- Civil rights for those living with disabilities

Read more at www.dpo.org/Platform

This election cycle, Democrats are poised to grow our majorities in Salem, return **Governor Kate Brown** to office, and elect Democrats up and down the ballot. Oregon's Democratic congressional delegation represents our values well in Washington, D.C., and electing **Jamie McLeod-Skinner** is an opportunity for Oregonians to assure all five of our House members speak for Oregonians first. We are proud to stand behind **Senator Ron Wyden, Senator Jeff Merkley, and our Democratic representatives**.

Oregon Democrats recommend the following votes on November statewide ballot measures:

Yes: Measure 102 **No:** Measures 103, 104, 105, 106 We invite all Oregonians to join us in affirming our determination that Oregon continue to become a beacon of opportunity, tolerance, and freedom.

Learn more at www.dpo.org, on Facebook at www.facebook.com/ORDems, and on Twitter at @ORDems.

(This information furnished by Democratic Party of Oregon.)

Independent Party

A 2018 PEW poll found only 40% of American have a favorable view of the Democratic or Republican parties. Gallup polling shows that 61% of Americans and 71% of millennials said we need a third major party. Are you one of them?

Because you should know, the Independent Party of Oregon (IPO) is that third party.

- We're the fastest growing party in Oregon, adding over 120,000 members since 2007.
- We're not a fringe party. About 6.5% of all local office holders (city council members, commissioners, mayors) are IPO members.
- We're highly informed, rational, and non-tribal voters.
- We support policies that are good for all citizens, even when it means we share in some sacrifice.
- Our platform is socially liberal, fiscally responsible and environmentally aware.
- We fight to prevent big money from buying government policy at all levels of government.

If you agree send a message: [CHANGE YOUR REGISTRATION TO INDEPENDENT PARTY.](#)

ABOUT THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

The Independent Party of Oregon (IPO) was formed 11 years ago to provide voters with more voices and more choices. We have grown into Oregon's third largest party, with over 120,000 members.

We think ordinary citizens don't have enough influence over government policy. Government is not accountable, and politics has become too partisan and dominated by special interests and their money. There is not enough problem-solving.

We work to:

- Oppose spending on inefficient government programs.
- Reduce special interest and "big money" influence over all government processes.
- Increase transparency in government, especially on how tax dollars are spent.
- Improve education and job training opportunities for Oregonians.
- Protect the environment from all types of insult.
- Protect Oregon consumers from ripoffs and abuse.
- Provide incentives for business creation and expansion in Oregon, but only if the incentives return greater public benefit than they cost.

We have led several fights in the Oregon Legislature for effective disclosure of campaign contributions, for transparency in government, and for more citizen participation in elections.

2018 PLATFORM

Our 2018 expanded platform (www.indparty.com/platform) is based on our member surveys. Our goal is to align public policies with the priorities of ordinary citizens in the areas of health care, education, campaign and ethics reform, and environmental policy. See our past Voters' Pamphlet statements at www.indparty.com/vp.

COMMUNITY-BASED CANDIDATES

We support candidates who have the backing and trust of their local communities, not the special interests that dominate the Republican and Democratic agendas. These special interests accounted for 97 percent of the \$133 million spent on Oregon political campaigns in 2016 and most of the \$31 million spent on state-level lobbying. In contrast, our small-donor democracy program provides support services for first time candidates.

WE ARE HAVING AN IMPACT

In 2017, we began urging the Oregon Legislature to strengthen regulations on industrial polluters. Neither the Republicans nor Democrats would confront large polluters. 3/4ths of all industrial polluters in Oregon were operating under invalid permits that in some cases were decades old. The EPA in 2015 revealed that Multnomah County and Portland are among the 1 to 2 percent worst places in America for airborne illness – including lung cancer – due to the high levels of pollution from industrial and vehicle emissions, particularly diesel trucks.

After a 2018 audit by Oregon's Secretary of State revealed that the Department of Environmental Quality was failing to meet its core regulatory functions, a coalition succeeded in passing the first major overhaul of the state's regulation of industrial polluters in more than two decades.

We have also led the way in stopping the Legislature from making Oregon's campaign finance laws even worse. The Center for Public Integrity (2015) ranked Oregon's campaign finance system as the worst in America – except for Mississippi.

OREGON BALLOT MEASURES:

YES on Measure 102 NO on Measures 103, 105, 106

PORTLAND BALLOT MEASURE:

YES on Measure 26-200 (campaign finance reform)

REGISTER AS INDEPENDENT PARTY MEMBER AND VOTE

www.indparty.com/register

VOTE. THINK. BE. INDEPENDENT.

www.indparty.com — info@indparty.com — 503-437-2833

(This information furnished by Independent Party of Oregon.)

Libertarian Party

Whether you are conservative, liberal, or moderate, the time has come to vote for Libertarians.

You wanted your government to reflect your values, and help you build a society having those values. Liberals believe in individuals having social freedoms, and resent government interference in that; but also believe in government having strong control over the economy. On the contrary, Conservatives believe in economic freedoms, resenting government interference in that, but also believe in government having strong control over social issues and behaviors. The moderate/centrist (non-extremist) Democrats and Republicans believe in both liberal governmental economic controls and conservative social controls, and not so much in their freedoms. And so, Liberals have voted for Democrats to try to make their government liberal, while Conservatives have voted for Republicans to try to make their government conservative. The result is not liberal or conservative government, but stalemate. Yes, our government swings more liberal or more conservative from time to time, but we can now conclude that neither Liberals nor Conservatives will ever be able to establish or sustain a liberal or conservative government.

So, what are you getting instead of liberalism or conservatism by voting for Liberals/Democrats or Conservatives/Republicans? Since both ideologies/parties ultimately believe in the goodness of government controls and force, more so than the goodness of individual freedom and volunteerism, we are getting more government control over both social behaviors and economic matters, and less individual freedom and volunteerism. Bipartisan compromise – helped along by moderates/centrists within both parties – has consisted of agreeing to governmental social controls for the Conservatives and economic controls for the Liberals, and not agreeing to social or economic freedoms for individuals. We are moving toward total control of society, both social and economic, by the government – totalitarianism. Liberals, Conservatives, and moderates/centrists are effectively leading their parties and our government, through compromise, collaboration, and cooperation, to a bipartisan totalitarian government, leaving individual freedoms and the free market in their wake.

Proof of our march toward a totalitarian government is a \$4.4 trillion federal budget, \$1 trillion deficit, \$21 trillion debt, \$trillions of unfunded Social Security and Medicare and federal pension liabilities, and equally bloated state and local budgets and unfunded liabilities (government pensions). All this money is for more government employees, allowing more and more governmental control over our lives and economy. Where will this end? Either a full totalitarian state, or a bankrupt state, as creditors stop purchasing the loans that fund our budget, deficit, and debt.

But there exists another form of centrist – the Libertarians. We believe in the social freedoms espoused by Liberals and the economic freedoms espoused by Conservatives. We are against the social governmental controls of the Conservatives and the economic governmental controls of the Liberals. We want to lead the Democrats and Republicans to social and economic freedoms through compromise, collaboration, and cooperation, and away from total governmental control. We want a libertarian government and society, not one that is totalitarian.

Libertarians believe that government is needed to restrain the unwanted use of force by others against your life, liberty, or property. We do not believe that government should initiate force to achieve social or economic ideals or goals. We believe you should be as free as possible to live your life, as long as you do not infringe upon others' freedom in doing so – government should not interfere. We have many ideas on how to best transform our country from dependency on government, to one that is based on freedom and volunteerism. We believe in the goodness of Humanity itself, and one that does not need the care, consent, or force of its government.

This is why you should vote Libertarians into office. Only a few of us are needed to guide Democrats and Republicans to freedom and liberty, and away from bondage and tyranny. Trust us – we'll do it.

<http://lporegon.org>

<http://www.lp.org/platform/>

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

(This information furnished by the Libertarian Party of Oregon.)

Pacific Green Party

*Pacific Green Party
Neither Left, Nor Right - But UpFront!*

Join us! Change your party registration at OregonVotes.gov or tear out the page in the front of this voter guide.

Already a Green? Most likely we can't reach you. The state voter database does not have your phone or email. Please update your name and contact information at pacificgreens.org

*Pacific Green Party
Leading the Way to a Green Economy for the 99%*

1) Ranked Choice Voting - Voting reform: you rank candidates 1st, 2nd and 3rd. This allows you to vote for the candidate you really want, knowing your vote will always count. If your 1st choice does not get a majority, their vote get transferred to your 2nd choice. Approved in Benton County thanks to Greens. Used in the state of Maine and much of the world: fairvote.org/rcv

2) Supporting renters, economic justice - Only the Green Party has a platform that supports rent control and ending no cause evictions. We also support a living wage: earnings to be based on the local cost of housing (housing = max 30% of your budget) livingwage.mit.edu

3) The Green New Deal: an economy based on conservation – creates well-paying jobs by repairing infrastructure while decreasing our dependence on fossil fuels and chemicals. Support local economies, stop overspending on war www.portlandcleanenergyfund.com.

*Contact or donate to these
Green Party Endorsed Candidates*

Mark Koller US District 3 - marckoller4congress.com
Tim Dehne Benton County Commissioner – facebook.com Tim Dehne
Drew Layda US District 1 - layda2018.com
Mike Beilstein US House District 4 - newmenu.org/mikebeilstein
JoAnn Hardesty - Portland City Council - joannforportland.com
Michael Sonnleitner Portland Community College Board - www.zone3pcc.com

The Green Party Platform supports policies such as:

Social Justice: **Black Lives Matter**; end the cash bail system - **Single Payer Healthcare** including dental and mental healthcare - **Immigration reform** with family and worker protections - **an end to Corporate "Personhood"**: money is property, not speech; corporations are legal entities, not persons (movetoamend.org) - **an end to the militarization of our economy**; fiscally responsible budgets that favor the 99%. www.gp.org/platform

Take action, contact us: PacificGreens.org, (541) 516-6059, info@pacificgreens.org, facebook, twitter

(This information furnished by Pacific Green Party.)

Progressive Party

OUR CANDIDATES

Chris Henry	Governor	Marc Koller	U.S. House #3
Jeff Golden	State Senate #3	Peter DeFazio	U.S. House #4
Marty Wilde	State House #11	Danny Jaffer	State House #23
Renee White	State House #17	Amanda La Bell	State House #54
Mike Ellison	State House #19	Jo Ann Bowman	PDX City Council

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

WE OPPOSE: the corruption of elections by Big Money, Wall Street bailouts, wars in Afghanistan and Iraq/Syria, "corporate personhood," and "free trade" agreements that let corporations destroy policies to protect labor, the environment, and consumers.

WE SUPPORT: real campaign finance reform, Medicare for All, equal rights (including same-sex marriage), tax reform to reduce the middle class burden, action against air pollution and climate change, and \$15 minimum wage for all, now.

We are Very Different from the Establishment Parties	Democratic	Republican	Progressive
Real campaign finance reform in <u>Oregon</u>	NO	NO	YES
Oppose "free trade" deals; support local products and services	NO	NO	YES
End "corporate personhood," constitutional rights for corporations	NO	NO	YES
"Medicare for All" comprehensive health care	NO	NO	YES
Oppose cuts in Social Security & Medicare benefits	NO	NO	YES
Increase minimum wage to living wage (\$15 or more <u>now</u>)	NO	NO	YES
Employment for All (public works projects, clean energy jobs)	NO	NO	YES
Repair, improve infrastructure (transit, water systems, etc.)	WEAK	NO	STRONG
Create a State Bank to invest state funds in Oregon jobs, avoid Wall Street, handle marijuana cash	NO	NO	YES
Increase income taxes on big corporations and the wealthy	NO	NO	YES
Oppose special sessions of Oregon Legislature to cut taxes for corporations and the wealthy	NO	NO	YES
Oppose Wall Street bailouts, sweetheart contracts with Oregon	NO	NO	YES
Strictly regulate toxic air pollution, including diesel emissions; fight climate change	NO	NO	YES
Oppose wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, Iraq/Syria; bring troops home now	NO	NO	YES
Slash military spending and foreign bases	NO	NO	YES
Enable grass-roots efforts to effectively use the initiative and referendum	NO	NO	YES
Equal rights for all; same-sex marriage	NUVR*	NO	YES
Oppose fossil fuel exports from Pacific Northwest ports, including Jordan Cove	NO	NO	YES
Oppose transport of oil by train through Oregon	NO	NO	YES
Require labeling of genetically engineered food	NO	NO	YES

*NUVR = Not Until Very Recently

OREGON ISSUES

Real Campaign Finance Reform: Oregon Democrats and Republicans have never enacted political campaign contribution limits but have repealed voter-enacted limits 3 times. Campaign spending for Oregon state offices has skyrocketed from \$4 million in 1996 to \$50 million in 2016 and probably over \$60 million in 2018. Winning a contested race for the Legislature now typically costs over \$750,000, sometimes over \$1 million per candidate. 2018 candidates for Governor have already raised over \$12 million.

The Center for Public Integrity in 2015 graded Oregon an overall "F" in systems to avoid government corruption.

Oregon = 2nd worst of 50 states in control of "Political Financing," beating only Mississippi.

Ten states now require that political ads identify their top funders; not Oregon.

Get involved with state and local campaign finance reform: honest-elections.com.

Invest in Oregon: Oregon's \$103 billion of state funds should be invested in public works and jobs for Oregonians (including clean energy jobs), instead of going to vulture capitalists, corporate raiders, fossil fuel corporations, and polluters.

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.

Stop Government Promotion of Gambling: Including video poker.

Other Issues: See our testimony on hundreds of bills at the Oregon Legislature: progparty.org/leg

OREGON BALLOT MEASURES:

YES on Measure 102

NO on Measures 103, 104, 105, 106 **PORTLAND BALLOT MEASURES:**

YES on Measure 26-200 (campaign finance reform)

YES on Measure 26-201 (clean energy jobs)

YES on LANE COUNTY MEASURE 20-290 (STAR voting)

progparty.org

info@progparty.org

503-548-2797

(This information furnished by Oregon Progressive Party.)

Republican Party

THE OREGON REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Oregon Republican Party is working for all Oregonians by promoting limited government, lower taxes, and personal responsibility.

We ask you to support our candidates because these basic principles improve our nation and our state for everyone. Limiting government to its proper roles gives you more opportunity. Lowering taxes lets you keep more of the money you earn and support your family. Personal responsibility reduces your dependence on government and maximizes your freedom.

We're proud to be the majority party in many parts of Oregon, but we need your help to implement our policies statewide. It has been over 24 years since Republican policies were implemented statewide in Oregon, and now we are all seeing the results: cronyism, corruption, and special-interest-control of the Democrat legislative majority.

It is time to put an end to the damaging effects of the Democrat one-party-rule on Oregon. Hundreds of Republican elected leaders are working hard every day to put Republican ideas into action to benefit all Oregonians. But they need your vote.

- Our state and our nation are facing incredible challenges from terrorism, past presidential failures, incompetent leadership and the corruption of the Obama-Clinton-Pelosi-Schumer Democrats. Electing our Republican candidates will bring a change to that system.
- We must hold the Democrats accountable for the millions and millions of your tax dollars wasted. End the Democrat's corruption, scandal, waste, abuse and cronyism.
- Oregon Republicans say NO to the constant barrage of new taxes. Help us tell the Democrats to stop wasting our tax dollars and refocus priorities on the real needs of Oregonians - jobs, the economy, education, security and freedom.
- 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.
- Over the last decade, 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 dollar count. We're working to make our children's future safer, allowing them to compete in today's market.

Come join the Oregon Republican Party. Be part of the political process and our winning team. Register as a Republican and become an active and informed citizen. Join us, for a better Oregon!

Read our platform and you'll see that our values match yours:

National Republican Party Platform: gop.com/platform

Oregon Republican Party Platform: oregon.gop/platform

Republicans are starting to 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 2018. They are ready to lead Oregon back to prosperity:

KNUTE BUEHLER for Governor: knutebuehler.com

JAN VERBEEK for 1st Congressional District: facebook.com/JohnVerbeekForOregon

GREG WALDEN for 2nd Congressional District: gregwalden.com

ART ROBINSON for 4th Congressional District: artforcongress.com

MARK CALLAHAN for 5th Congressional District: callahanfororegon.com

OREGON HOUSE REPUBLICANS: oregonhouserepublicans.org

OREGON SENATE REPUBLICANS: theleadershipfund.com

Our recommendations for the 2018 ballot measures:

Measure **103** – Vote **Yes** – Halt the tax on groceries; it hurts those who can least afford to pay it

Measure **104** – Vote **Yes** – Require the legislature follow the Oregon Constitution when raising revenue

Measure **105** – Vote **Yes** – Prevent Oregon from becoming yet another unsafe criminal sanctuary

Measure **106** – Vote **Yes** – Stop taxpayer funding of abortion except when medically necessary

Visit the Oregon Republican Party: oregon.gop

Oregon Republican Party

info@oregon.gop · 503-595-8881

PO Box 25406, Portland, OR 97289

(This information furnished by Oregon Republican Party.)

Working Families Party

What is the Working Families Party?

The Working Families Party is about building an Oregon that works for all of us, not just the wealthy and well connected.

How do we build political power for working people?

The Working Families Party is a minor political party that uses fusion voting, which allows us to cross-nominate candidates from major parties if they support our values and our issues. If not, we can run our own candidates, but we prefer not to be spoilers or to waste your vote.

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.

What do we stand for?

THE OREGON WORKING FAMILIES PARTY PLATFORM

→ A Democracy that Works for the 99%

We vigorously fight any efforts to suppress voters. We must eliminate the ability of wealthy donors and corporations to buy politicians and protect the integrity of our voting system from all threats, foreign and domestic.

→ Building Worker Power

We demand fair rules and legislation that strengthen unions and create fair working conditions for everyone. We encourage all workers to form or join unions and bargain collectively to determine their terms and conditions of employment. We must restore the right to strike.

→ Health Care for Everyone

Health care and quality housing are human rights. Society has an obligation to be certain that everyone has a decent place to live, access to health care, and clean air, clean water, and a healthy climate free from pollution. It's long past time for us to join the rest of the world by establishing improved and expanded Medicare for all. Everybody in, nobody out.

→ Quality, Free Education

Quality education is the backbone of any society. We must make public pre-K- 12 a priority again and eliminate schemes that siphon public funds from the public system. Higher education, including trade schools, public colleges, and universities must all be tuition free.

→ Fixing our Broken Criminal Justice System

We demand an end to mass incarceration and the for-profit prison system. We must end forced arbitration schemes used to shield the abuse of corporations. We oppose minimum sentencing requirements that have resulted in the world's largest prison population.

→ Comprehensive Immigration Reform

Our party stands for fair comprehensive immigration reform that realigns legal immigration standards to reflect today's conditions, a system not based on race. The two decades old experiment called ICE has failed; it's time to eliminate ICE.

→ Creating a State Bank

We don't need billionaire bankers. We need a state bank to support small businesses and family farms and keep Oregon's money in Oregon.

→ Fair Trade, Fair Economy

We need trade rules that build strong economies among all trading partners, that enable enforcement of domestic labor and environmental laws, and that regulate and tax global capital. We fight for a just transition away from the global fossil fuel economy that guarantees working families sustainable livelihoods for generations to come.

→ Tax the Rich

It's high time that wealthy individuals and corporations pay their fair share of taxes. Their greed impacts every aspect of our lives. We must reestablish the tax rates of the 1950's and 60's when our country built a strong middle class and the infrastructure necessary for a strong economy. The Oregon Working Families Party will leave no one behind.

Join us!

The Working Families Party is the electoral arm of the Resistance. We are working to create a party that represents all working people of all identities. Vote for WFP-nominated candidates and help us build an organization that can truly represent working people in Oregon politics.

www.workingfamilies.org

(This information furnished by Working Families Party of Oregon.)

Partisan Candidates

US Representative

4th District

Art Robinson
Republican, Constitution

Richard R Jacobson*
Libertarian

Mike Beilstein
Pacific Green

Peter DeFazio
Democrat, Independent, Working Families

Governor

Aaron Auer
Constitution

Nick Chen
Libertarian

Kate Brown
Democrat, Working Families

Knute Buehler
Republican

Patrick Starnes
Independent

Chris Henry*
Progressive

State Senator

6th District

Lee L Beyer
Democrat

Robert Schwartz
Republican

8th District

Sara A Gelser
Democrat, Working Families, Independent

Bryan Eggiman*
Libertarian

Erik S Parks
Republican

State Representative

11th District

Marty Wilde
Democrat, Working Families, Progressive

Mark F Herbert
Republican, Independent

15th District

Jerred Taylor
Democrat, Working Families

Shelly Boshart Davis
Republican

Cynthia Hyatt
Independent, Progressive

17th District

Renee Windsor-White
Democrat, Progressive, Working Families

Sherrie Sprenger
Republican, Independent

County Commissioner

Linn County, Position 1

John K Lindsey
Republican

Gary Sullivan
Independent

Stephanie Newton
Democrat

Nonpartisan Candidates

Judge of the Supreme Court

Position 5

Adrienne Nelson

Judge of the Court of Appeals

Position 2

Bronson D James*

Position 4

Robyn Ridler Aoyagi

Position 7

Steven R Powers

Judge of the Oregon Tax Court

Robert Manicke

Judge of the Circuit Court

23rd District, Position 1

Michael Wynhausen
Fay Stetz-Waters

23rd District, Position 3

Rachel Kittson-MaQatish
Teri L Plagmann

County Assessor

Linn County

Andy R Stevens*

County Clerk

Linn County

Steve Druckenmiller*

County Sheriff

Linn County

Jim Yon*

Mayor

City of Albany

Sharon Konopa
Charley R Smith*

City Councilor

City of Albany, Ward I - A

Dick Olsen

City of Albany, Ward II - A

Alex Johnson
C Jeffery Evans*

City of Albany, Ward III - A

Bessie Johnson
Jessi Brenneman

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

This is a complete listing of federal and state candidates for the November 6, 2018, 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.

Measure

102

Amends Constitution: Allows local bonds for financing affordable housing with nongovernmental entities. Requires voter approval, annual audits.

103

Amends Constitution: Prohibits taxes/fees based on transactions for "groceries" (defined) enacted or amended after September 2017

104

Amends Constitution: Expands (beyond taxes) application of requirement that three-fifths legislative majority approve bills raising revenue

105

Repeals law limiting use of state/local law enforcement resources to enforce federal immigration laws

106

Amends Constitution: Prohibits spending "public funds" (defined) directly/indirectly for "abortion" (defined); exceptions; reduces abortion access

22-174


Second Amendment Preservation Ordinance

22-176


Making the Linn County Surveyor an appointed position.

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 the candidate's name on the blank 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 8683** 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.

US Representative, 4th District

Art Robinson

Republican
Constitution

Occupation: Scientist;
Educator; Businessman

Occupational Background:
Faculty, UC San Diego; Research
Associate, Stanford University;

President, Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine

Educational Background: Caltech BS; UC San Diego PhD

Prior Governmental Experience: No government office.

- **Our nation and our people must prosper!**

We must lift the dead hand of government off the backs of our people, so that the liberty, freedom, justice, and equality of opportunity of all Americans are assured. To do this, we should replace career politicians, who place their own self-interests above the interests of our people and nation.

- **American Security**

We must protect the lives of all Americans, born and unborn, through legislation that is pro-life and pro-Second Amendment. We must secure our borders and end illegal immigration.

- **Fiscal Responsibility**

We must balance the federal budget to assure that our financial obligations to social security, national defense, and other essential commitments can be paid.

- **Justice for All**

We must end unconstitutional corporatism so that American businesses compete in the marketplace, rather than in buying favors from politicians, and we must assure that all Americans, those in the highest positions and those who are the least fortunate, are treated equally before the law.

- **Keep our National Contract and Heritage**

We must rigorously follow the rules of our Constitutional Republic. No governmental action should be taken that violates the Constitution.

- **Defend our Nation**

The strength of our military must be maintained at the highest level, both by adequate investment and by avoiding involvement in unnecessary foreign adventures.

- **Education**

Our schools should be the best in the world - controlled by our parents, teachers, and local communities.

- **Support President Trump**

The President is working to improve our economy, diminish trade inequities, normalize our borders, improve education, reduce the opioid epidemic, improve our timber and other natural resources, strengthen our defenses, and reduce the threat of war. Congress should support the President - not oppose him for political gain, as does DeFazio.

- **Prov 3:5-6**

www.ArtForCongress.com

(This information furnished by Art Robinson for Congress.)

US Representative, 4th District

Mike Beilstein

Pacific Green

Occupation: Chemist, retired

Occupational Background:
Research chemist, Oregon
State University; Peace Corps
Volunteer, Lesotho, Southern
Africa.

Educational Background: MA Home Economics (human nutrition) 1981, Oregon State University; BA Biochemistry/ Biophysics 1973, Oregon State University

Prior Governmental Experience: Corvallis City Council 1999-2000, 2007-2016

More than 50 years ago, Martin Luther King, Jr. said, "The USA is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world". It is more true today. Military contractors, generals and their supporters in congress have made the US government a mechanism for siphoning wealth out of the nation and into the pockets of the oligarchs.

While not at war with anyone, we drop bombs on "enemies" at the rate of one every 12 minutes, 120 times per day, 44,000 times a year. The result is failed states, disrupted economies, refugee crises, local rule by war lords and religious fanatics, and easy recruitment for "terrorists" who have legitimate grievances with the USA.

Domestically we get mass incarceration of people of color, private prison construction, militarizing of police, a kafkaesque surveillance regime tracking every communication and every credit transaction, an immigrant labor system that drives down wages coupled to attacks on labor organizing, and the promulgation of fear to justify spending over half the discretionary federal budget on war making. Deteriorating infrastructure, poverty and ecological catastrophe are ignored, or actually encouraged, to boost profits for the wealthy.

In the US Congress, I will introduce legislation to:

- reduce military spending by half,
- end the military occupation of Japan, Korea and Germany
- return Guantanamo Bay to the Cuban people,
- ban the export of weapons of mass destruction (including small arms),
- end "regime change" programs in Syria, Cuba and Venezuela,
- end detention of refugees awaiting asylum hearings,
- end military assistance to Colombia, Israel and Saudi Arabia, and
- leave the NATO military alliance.

(This information furnished by Mike Beilstein.)

US Representative, 4th District



Peter DeFazio

Democrat
Independent
Working Families

Occupation: U.S. Representative
Occupational Background: U.S. Air Force Reserve

Educational Background: Tufts University, University of Oregon M.A.

Prior Governmental Experience: Chair, Lane County Commission

Peter DeFazio is the leader we need to take on a partisan, dysfunctional Washington that rigs the system to benefit the wealthy and special interests. **Peter DeFazio stands up for what we believe in.** DeFazio's common-sense proposals aim to create good-paying jobs, restore economic and educational opportunities, hold government accountable and tip the scales of inequality back in favor of hard-working Oregonians.

- **DeFazio demands that the Veterans Administration serve veterans as they did for our country.** DeFazio led the charge to improve VA health care and secured funding for a new clinic for local vets. After complaints of poor care, mismanagement, and whistleblower retaliation at the Roseburg VA, DeFazio demanded investigations that resulted in the removal of senior bureaucratic officials and improved health care for Oregon's veterans.
- **DeFazio's solutions address health care costs** by expanding coverage, creating options outside of the for-profit insurance industry, protecting consumers, and strengthening Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.
- **Peter DeFazio will always defend a woman's right to choose** and access reproductive health care. He stood up to congressional leaders when they voted to defund Planned Parenthood and allow employers to deny women basic health care coverage. DeFazio will oppose efforts to roll back Roe v Wade and believes that a woman's right to choose is a private, personal decision.
- **DeFazio has voted against every congressional pay raise and has refused to accept raises.** Instead, he uses the money to fund scholarships at five Oregon community colleges because he believes that everyone should have access to education without crippling debt. By the end of 2018, DeFazio will have funded 270 scholarships.

**Peter DeFazio for Congress-
he stands up for what we believe in.**

Proud nominee of the Democratic Party, Independent Party of Oregon, Working Families Party, and Oregon Progressive Party.

To learn more visit: www.defazioforcongress.org

(This information furnished by DeFazio for Congress.)

Governor



Aaron Auer

Constitution

Occupation: Circuit Rider, Minister of the Gospel
Occupational Background: Self-employed, Pioneering Pastor
Educational Background: Rhema Bible Training Center

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. Honesty 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.

**LOVING TRUTH, RIGHTEOUSNESS, LIBERTY
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." Genesis

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



Nick Chen

Libertarian

Occupation: Logistics

Occupational Background:
Navy

Educational Background:
Engineering

Prior Governmental

Experience: None

Growing up Oregonian, you don't see rain the same way. You don't think about it walking. Shirts only stay wet a little while in the warmth of your home. You see the rain within the leaves of our trees and rivers feeding our state. Rivers paddled down your whole life, past towns no one would ever know because to the rest of the world they seem forgotten. The population grows larger along the Interstate, yet can't forget the people who are a part of you. We wait for our leaders to talk about how *their* decisions will affect our friends in Hermiston, Klamath, and Rome.

Now I've grown and see my Country and State divided. Our Diversity in thought, values, and cultures should be considered our strength. Instead, dividing us into teams incapable of communication or collaboration. Fear each culture is being lost to another when together they are only changing with time. Our children are learning from us and blending them together. We hope it's the good, what good have we taught them? Have we shown we've moved beyond reasonable discourse? Have we taught them to face our fears? Not do the easy thing, but to become greater we must challenge ourselves?

Each of us have different beliefs in what is most important. What I value most is the freedom and liberty to have and share these different perspectives. I believe in building a government that protects every single person, not any group in particular. A government that can be empathetic, but also understands that reckless spending will end poorly for us all.

In the meantime, we cannot wait to Stand Together. We must hold the door for each other irrespective of race, religion, sexual orientation, or ideology, doing so simply because it's the right thing. We must all be brave enough to stand up as Americans and stand together, Oregonians.

www.nickchen.org

(This information furnished by NICK CHEN.)

Governor



Kate Brown

Democrat
Working Families

Occupation: Governor

Occupational Background:
Family and Children's Advocate, PSU Instructor

Educational Background:
University of Colorado, Northwestern School of Law, Lewis and Clark College

Prior Governmental Experience: State Representative, State Senator, Secretary of State, Governor

Protecting healthcare for Oregon families

When politicians like Knute Buehler tried to take healthcare away from 430,000 Oregonians, Kate Brown stood strong to protect our coverage and make sure every child in Oregon has access to healthcare.

"Knute Buehler voted against Medicaid and cheaper prescription drugs." - Oregon Nurses Association

Standing for women's rights

With Republican politicians trying to restrict access to essential women's healthcare, Kate Brown will stand up to protect our right to choose.

"We can't trust Knute Buehler to protect women's reproductive rights. He keeps saying one thing and doing another." - Planned Parenthood PAC of Oregon

Leading the way for good jobs

Kate Brown helped workers get job training tied to local jobs with real benefits. And she brought Democrats and Republicans together to fix our roads, reduce congestion and created 16,000 new jobs.

"When we needed help in Eastern Oregon, Kate Brown delivered." - Grant Kitamura, Republican business leader

Making sure Oregonians get a good quality education

Kate Brown signed the Oregon Promise, reducing community college tuition to as low as \$50 a term for high school graduates. She put career education back in our schools, so students graduate with a plan for their future.

"Buehler's plan to fund schools is to cut teacher pay, making it harder to recruit and retain good teachers." - Sara Schmitt, second grade teacher, Beaverton

Fighting for the Oregon we love

Kate Brown is protecting our public lands, fighting for clean air and water, and holding polluters accountable.

"Knute Buehler has a lifetime legislative grade of "F" on environmental protection" - Oregon League of Conservation Voters

We can trust Kate Brown to be on our side. She works hard to help Oregonians make ends meet and ensure their families get ahead.

(This information furnished by Kate Brown Committee.)

Governor



Knute Buehler

Republican

Occupation: Physician; State Representative

Occupational Background: Business owner

Educational Background: Roseburg High; Oregon State University; Rhodes Scholar, Johns Hopkins, M.D.

Prior Governmental Experience: Budget Committee, Bend-La Pine Schools

KNUTE WILL LEAD WHERE KATE BROWN HAS FAILED

Under Kate Brown, Oregon's budget is the biggest ever—but we're failing to achieve our full potential. Graduation rates stuck at 48th in the nation; #1 in child homelessness; Foster care chaos and lingering rural unemployment. Oregon can and should be so much better.

A MODERATE AND INDEPENDENT LEADER

Pro-choice: Wrote over-the-counter birth control law

Climate change: Voted to replace coal energy with renewables

Gun safety: Broke with Republicans to protect survivors of domestic violence

Civil rights: Early supporter of marriage equality

AMBITIOUS PLANS TO SOLVE BIG PROBLEMS

IMPROVING EDUCATION

"Oregon's classroom funding crisis means our teachers get cut, class sizes rise, and graduation rates don't improve. Kate Brown refuses to fix the problem. Knute will lead schools to the top five in the nation with stronger classroom funding, more school days and access to career education."

Kathryn Calcagno, Teacher, Democrat, Multnomah County

ENDING HOMELESSNESS

"Homelessness is worse under Kate Brown. Knute believes a street or sidewalk should never be anyone's home. His plan balances compassion with tough love—replacing tents with emergency shelters, enhanced access to mental health and drug treatment and stronger public safety."

Danielle Miller, Democrat, Clackamas County

PROTECTING HEALTH CARE

"As a doctor, Knute understands that health care is a basic family need. He opposed cuts jeopardizing care for thousands of Oregonians. His plan stabilizes Medicaid funding and protects a woman's right to choose."

Dr. Tammy Bull, OB/GYN, Deschutes County

SHARED PROSPERITY

"For years, Kate Brown has accepted higher unemployment and poverty in rural communities. Knute will be Governor for all of Oregon—not a single region, party or ideology. He will break down barriers, sign permits and champion job growth for rural communities."

Marie Bowers, Fifth-generation farmer, Lane County

KNUTEBUEHLER.COM

(This information furnished by Knute for Governor.)

Governor



Patrick Starnes

Independent

Occupation: Cabinetmaker for 30 years

Occupational Background: Decades of Public Service

Educational Background: Graduated from Umpqua

Community College and University of Oregon with degree in history.

Prior Governmental Experience: Elected twice to Douglas Education Service District and once to McKenzie School Board (over ten years experience)

Biography

Patrick Starnes grew up in Oregon and went to Winston-Dillard Schools while his father worked at the particle board mill to support the family. Starnes worked as a freelance cabinetmaker for over 30 years. Currently he and his wife make their living restoring old houses in Brownsville.

FIRST 100 DAYS OF REFORM

Patrick Starnes makes only one promise: once elected he will get big money out of politics. He will bring together and lead a bi-partisan caucus of state senators and state representatives to legislate cleaner and more transparent campaign finance laws. Currently, Oregon is in the bottom of all states in the nation on honest election laws (only above Mississippi), according to the Center for Public Integrity. We will become a leader in campaign finance reform.

If we do not get big money out of politics, nothing can ever change for the better. Campaign finance reform leads to other Oregon reforms.

END GERRYMANDERING

After the 2020 census, Oregon will have to create a new sixth congressional district. The next Oregon Governor will lead the effort of redistricting. New maps will be drawn across the state, and Starnes wants to make sure these maps do not favor one party over the other. Starnes will create a non-partisan commission using 21st century technology to draw rational, non-partisan districts that make sense, ending unfair gerrymandering.

OPEN PRIMARY

Every May, 30% of Oregon voters (over 830,000 non-affiliated voters) are limited from voting in the Oregon Primary. Starnes will lead the effort to open our primary so all voters can vote in Oregon.

Call: **541-580-9120** or email: patrickstarnes@live.com

For more info visit: starnesfororegon.com

(This information furnished by Starnes for Oregon.)

State Senator, 6th District



Lee L Beyer

Democrat

Occupation: State Senator

Occupational Background: Chairman, Oregon Public Utility Commission (PUC); Development Executive; Small Business Consultant and Advocate; Management

Analyst; Vocational/Professional Training Administrator; Millworker; U.S. Air Force.

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

Prior Governmental Experience: Willamalane Park Board, PUC; State Senate; State House of Representatives; Springfield City Council, Planning Commission and Budget Committee.

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

Lee Beyer

Making a Real Difference for Families

Lee worked to:

- Take on drug companies to make prescription drugs more affordable
- Create more family-wage jobs
- Repair our roads and crumbling bridges
- Ensure women finally receive equal pay for equal work
- Slow out-of-control college costs
- Make childcare affordable for working families
- Fight attempts to roll-back healthcare coverage for Oregonians

Dear Neighbors,

Four years ago you elected me to represent you in the State Senate, where I'm always working to create real economic opportunity, for both rural and urban areas, to fight for the schools our kids deserve, and to support our universities and community colleges.

I know it's critical that we keep Oregon's economy on track. That's why my top priority in the Senate was passing last year's historic transportation and jobs package to fund infrastructure improvements, keeps our roads safe, and create thousands of family-wage construction jobs.

Because education is the key to a bright future for our kids and our community, I am working to provide more funding to our public schools to reduce class sizes, hire more teachers and increase access to career and technical education.

It's been an honor and a privilege to work on your behalf, and I'm proud of the progress we've made.

But there is much more we can do. With your support, we can continue to make Oregon a great place to live, work and do business. I would appreciate your vote.

Sincerely,

Lee Beyer

Visit www.Vote.LeeBeyer.com

(This information furnished by Friends of Lee Beyer.)

State Senator, 6th District



Robert Schwartz

Republican

Occupation: Ballroom Dance Teacher

Occupational Background: Small Business

Educational Background: Raised by a single mother who taught me more than any school could.

Prior Governmental Experience: Passed HB3016 with Representative Lively

I will start by thanking everyone for their kindness. Over 1000 doors knocked on and only three people, wealthy liberals in the university area of Eugene, slammed the door in my face for no other reason except I am a Republican. I knock on every door, rich or poor, of any party because I don't discriminate. EVER.

Thanks to my democratic opponent, Senator Beyer. We met at Island Park near my home in Springfield; he told me about his family and the challenges and joys of serving in Salem for 27 years. We shared a few laughs about crazy things that happen campaigning and even though we have different ideas about the role of government it was a fun and informative afternoon.

Thanks to Representative Lively, although we belong to different parties he has been a mentor to me since I was his opponent in 2016. He explained some of the complex inter-workings of state government and I love him for it.

Special thanks to Dennis Richardson, I heard him speak in 2015 and was so inspired I ran for public office.

Below is an example of how I would approach issues:

Oregon has generous government assistance programs. I suggest Oregon should promote good choices.

1. Reduce the options to buy junk food with the Oregon Trail Card. Diabetes can be a tragic illness that effects far to many of our neighbors and is sometimes preventable.

This shouldn't be perceived as punitive but only to maximize the benefits of the Oregon Trail Card.

Dear Springfield, Glenwood, Walterville, Coburg, Harrisburg, Halsey, Peoria, Shedd, Brownsville, Eugene, Lebanon, Crawfordsville, Holley and wonderful Creswell. Thank you, I learned so much from you. Details on the website.

Good Choice Government Is The Right Choice

Vote Robert Schwartz

www.oregonstatesenate.com

(This information furnished by Robert Schwartz.)

State Senator, 8th District



Sara A Gelser

Democrat
Working Families
Independent

Occupation: State Senator

Occupational Background: Family Support Coordinator, Oregon DHS; Instructor, LBCC

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

Prior Governmental Experience: Oregon House of Representatives, Corvallis School Board

**Re-Elect Sara Gelser
Always Leading the Fight for Us
Quality Schools**

As a mom and former school board member, Sara knows we need to reduce class size, expand career and technical education and ensure all kids have tools to succeed.

An Economy that Works for Everyone

Sara successfully fought to create a statewide paid sick leave program, increase the minimum wage and establish the strongest equal pay law in the nation. Now she's working to bring paid family leave to Oregon.

Protecting our Environment

Sara co-sponsored Oregon's Clean Fuels Program and is working to pass a strong carbon capping program.

Safer Communities

Sara toughened Oregon's rape laws. She spearheaded Karly's Law to ensure abused children get the immediate help they need, and she secured nearly \$28 million in safety enhancements for Highway 20.

Prioritizing Health and Human Services

Sara believes health care is a fundamental right and is an unwavering pro-choice leader. She is a relentless champion for improving Oregon's child welfare system and has a long record of fighting for the rights of people with disabilities.

Common Sense Gun Laws

Sara was proud to vote for universal background checks and establish extreme risk protection orders to keep guns out of the hands of people found to be dangerous to themselves or others.

ENDORSED BY:

- Karl Koenig, President - Oregon State Fire Fighters Council
- Oregon Nurses Association
- Oregon Education Association
- Planned Parenthood PAC of Oregon
- Oregon League of Conservation Voters
- Basic Rights Oregon Equality PAC
- SEIU
- Oregon Building Trades Council
- Oregon School Employees Association
- AFSCME 75
- NARAL ProChoice Oregon PAC
- United Food and Commercial Workers 555
- Humane Voters Oregon
- Oregon AFL-CIO

www.saragelser.com

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

State Senator, 8th District



Erik S Parks

Republican

Occupation: Electrician

Occupational Background: US Navy Interior Communications Electrician

Educational Background: Graduate Hood River Valley

High School

Prior Governmental Experience: Elected as a Precinct Committee Person in 2016

I currently serve as Chairman of the Linn County Republican Party. As Chair, I have spoken to hundreds of people from all walks of life in our community. The one thing we all have in common is that we are frustrated with what is going on in Salem.

I believe it's time for change. The current majority spends tax dollars like there is an unlimited supply. We have hard times ahead unless we solve the PERS problem and get OUR state out of debt. I would also like to do away with the Emergency clause.

I'm an Avid Outdoorsman.

I'm a US Navy Veteran, I served from 2001 thru 2006, during which time I participated in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

My Standards:

I BELIEVE the strength of Oregon lies with the individual and that each person's dignity, freedom, ability and responsibility must be honored.

I BELIEVE in equal rights, equal justice and equal opportunity for all; regardless of race, creed, sex, age or disability.

I BELIEVE free enterprise and encouraging individual initiative have brought this nation opportunity, economic growth and prosperity.

I BELIEVE government must practice fiscal responsibility and allow individuals to keep more of the money they earn.

I BELIEVE the proper role of government is to provide for the people only those critical functions that cannot be performed by individuals or private organizations and that the best government is that which governs least.

I BELIEVE the most effective, responsible and responsive government is government closest to the people.

I BELIEVE Oregonians must retain the principles that have made us strong while developing new and innovative ideas to meet the challenges of changing times.

Please Vote Erik Parks for State Senator, 8th District

(This information furnished by Parks for Oregon.)

vote!

www.oregonvotes.gov



View unofficial election results

starting at 8 pm on November 6

for more information about voting in Oregon

 **oregonvotes.gov**

 **1 866 673 8683**

se habla español

TTY 1 800 735 2900

for the hearing impaired

State Representative, 11th District



Marty Wilde

Democrat
Working Families
Progressive

Occupation: Executive Director, Lane County Medical Society; Colonel, Air National Guard

Occupational Background:

Judge Advocate, US Air Force; Deputy District Attorney

Educational Background: University of Oregon School of Law; University of Maryland

Prior Governmental Experience: Eugene Budget Committee; Eugene Police Commission; Lane County Performance Audit Committee; Long-Term Care Ombudsman; CASA Volunteer

**Marty Wilde
Values in Action**

Marty overcame childhood poverty in rural Lane County thanks to the support of his community's investments in public schools, food programs, and Medicaid. He's spent a career serving our community and country paying forward that debt.

During his years of service, Marty:

- Prosecuted cases of sexual assault and domestic violence
- Defended reproductive health care rights for women
- Earned a Bronze Star defending human rights in Afghanistan

For over 24 years, Marty has served in the US military. He has seen firsthand the struggles many veterans face when they're returning home. Marty will **lead the effort for more funding for veterans' services** and to help veterans get jobs.

Marty has worked with seniors in our community. His work showed him we need **better access to quality long-term care for our aging family members**, including in-home health care to keep people in their homes and active in their communities.

Marty is committed to **better school funding and smaller class sizes in our schools, increased renter protections, paid family leave, vocational training programs, more affordable housing, and family-wage job opportunities.**

"Marty's long career in the military and public service demonstrates that he's a tireless advocate for education, healthcare, and working to increase economic opportunity for all Oregonians. I know he will serve Lane and Linn Counties well." - **Congressman Peter DeFazio**

Stand With Marty

American Federation of Teachers
Oregon AFL-CIO

Oregon Coalition of Police and Sheriffs
Oregon Education Association
Oregon Nurses Association
OLCV

Karl Koenig, President - Oregon State Fire Fighters Council
Planned Parenthood PAC of Oregon
SEIU

The Mother PAC
VoteVets PAC
US Senator Jeff Merkley
US Senator Ron Wyden

www.WildeforOregon.com

(This information furnished by Wilde for Oregon.)

State Representative, 11th District



Mark F Herbert

Republican
Independent

Occupation: Management Consultant/Interim Executive Director Alvord Taylor, Inc.

Occupational Background: Thirty years as a management

consultant, business and human resources executive with a focus in human resources, organizational development, and strategic planning. Former Board Member of Goodwill Industries of Lane County, Volunteer Coach - The Honor Foundation. Track record of creating win-win solutions.

Educational Background: Graduate studies in Human Resources/Industrial Relations at the University of Oregon. BS in Management Arizona State University.

Prior Governmental Experience: Former Lane County Planning Commission member and Chairperson. Former Board member of the Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce, Lane Metro Partnership.

As a state we face major challenges with providing economic stability in all counties, declining performance of our K-12 educational systems, reduced funding for critical infrastructure including public safety, roads and other physical infrastructure, a lack of affordable housing and a homeless epidemic demanding more attention be given to mental health services.

We need more diversity in our educational curriculums with a new emphasis on vocational and technical training to give high school students who aren't going to a four year college a meaningful trade to make them employable.

We need public/private partnerships and leadership with a track record of building coalitions and delivering results.

As a human resource professional, executive, business owner, and executive director of a not for profit I have demonstrated my capabilities to create those relationships and deliver solutions not rhetoric. We need business and organizational leadership, not more politicians.

Oregon's issues need to be solved by Oregonians at the local, county, and State level.

Endorsements:

- Andy Petersen
- Gretchen Pierce
- Laurie Smart
- Casey Woodard
- National Federation of Independent Business/ORPAC AG-PAC
- Linn County Commissioner Roger Nyquist
- Oregon Small Business Association PAC
- Taxpayers Association of Oregon

(This information furnished by Friends of Mark Herbert.)

State Representative, 15th District



Jerred Taylor

Democrat
Working Families

Occupation: Supply Chain Manager

Occupational Background: Planning and Procurement Manager, Panasonic Eco

Solutions Solar America, LLC; Internal Coordinator, OSU Pride Center; Engineering Technician: United States Forest Service

Educational Background: Biological Engineering, Oregon State University

Prior Governmental Experience: Senate Chair, Associated Students of Oregon State University; Appropriations and Budgets Committee Chair, ASOSU Senate

A New Perspective for Albany, Millersburg and Tangent

“Oregon’s economy has been recovering, but working families and those on fixed incomes have seen their take-home pay shrink. Expenses - including rent, groceries, healthcare, childcare and taxes - have increased while wages haven’t. We need to fight for hard-working Oregonians and for an economy that works for all. I’m seeking your vote because the voices of those that work for a living, not just those with deep pockets, need to be heard in Salem.”

Jerred Will Fight for Working Families.

Jerred has worked in manufacturing for a decade. He started as a temporary employee, and worked as a production operator and manager. He will fight for stronger workplace protections and policies that grow family-wage jobs.

Jerred Will Fight for Public Education Funding.

Adequately funding public education provides opportunities for success and encourages economic growth. We need to bring back career and technical education, support K-12, Community Colleges, and Universities, and prepare our students for the jobs of the future.

Jerred Will Fight for Infrastructure Investment.

Improving our roads and bridges will make transportation more efficient and draw in more businesses. Our community is growing rapidly and it’s important that infrastructure dollars come to our district.

We are proud to stand with Jerred

- Congressman Peter DeFazio
- State Senator Sara Gelsler
- Albany Mayor Sharon Konopa
- Oregon Nurses Association
- American Federation of Teachers-Oregon
- Oregon School Employees Association
- United Food and Commercial Workers Local 555
- SEIU
- AFSCME 75
- Oregon League of Conservation Voters
- Joint Council of Teamsters No. 37
- Basic Rights Oregon Equality PAC
- Planned Parenthood PAC of Oregon

For more information visit:
<https://JerredTaylor.com>

(This information furnished by Friends of Jerred Taylor.)

State Representative, 15th District



Shelly Boshart Davis

Republican

Occupation: Owner, Boshart Trucking; Vice President International Sales, BOSSCO Trading

Occupational Background: Small business owner; Farmer

Educational Background: Oregon State University, BS Business Administration

Prior Governmental Experience: Linn County Budget Committee; Oregon Department of Transportation Technical Advisory Committee

Shelly Boshart Davis - Capable Leader

“Shelly brings incredible energy and expertise to the table. She understands the rural and urban issues in House District 15 and has taken the time to get involved in the legislative process over the past few sessions. Shelly is a great leader who will represent our district well.” - State Representative Andy Olson

“Shelly is a commonsense leader who understands the issues facing our community and has the skills to make a positive difference.” - Linn County Commissioner Roger Nyquist

“As owner of Boshart Trucking and a wife, mother of three, Shelly will bring a wealth of knowledge, experiences and expertise to the Oregon House of Representatives. Shelly knows the issues, recognizes challenges and is prepared to advocate for her future constituents.” - Janet Steele, President, Albany Area Chamber of Commerce.

“I grew up in rural Linn County and this is where I’ve chosen to build a business and raise a family. There are too many Portland based, career politicians passing legislation, with no idea how those laws impact us every day. They have forgotten what it’s like to be an ordinary person and navigate all their red tape. If you vote for me, I will advocate for teachers and our children’s education and more job-friendly policies. I’ll fight to protect small businesses and farms in Linn County and will do everything I can to hold government accountable. I will always listen and believe everyone should be treated with respect. I share your values and I am asking for your vote to represent our district in Salem.” - Shelly Boshart Davis

Also Endorsed by

- Oregon Farm Bureau Federation
- National Federation of Independent Business/ORPAC
- Oregon Chiefs of Police Association
- Oregon Education Association
- www.shellyboshartdavis.com

(This information furnished by Friends of Shelly Boshart Davis.)

State Representative, 15th District

Cynthia Hyatt

Independent
Progressive

Occupation: Jewelry designer,
store associate

Occupational Background:
Jewelry designer, volunteer
facilitator, volunteer firefighter,

phlebotomist, medical assistant, vehicle title clerk, mortgage
executive assistant

Educational Background: BS in Political Science, AS in
History, Diploma in Medical Assisting

Prior Governmental Experience: Legislative intern, lobbying,
Get Out the Vote-LBCC

Accountability: I believe in solid accountability of the govern-
ment's use of our tax dollars regarding how they are used
and how they are acquired. I also believe in accountability
of a candidate's use and acquisition of campaign funds. As
a representative I will work to ensure accountability and
transparency in how our government functions and spends
our tax dollars.

Protection: I believe in protecting our valuable resources
and responsible use of our waters, lands, and forests. As a
representative, I will work 110% to protect these resources
and retain them as accessible to all who enjoy them.

I believe in protecting the vulnerable in our communi-
ties across the state by offering resources that help them
with their needs whether it's food, health care, or job
opportunities.

I believe our 2nd Amendment rights should be preserved and
protected.

Common sense solutions: I believe we need common sense
solutions for health care and education. Children need a good
education to give them the tools they need to be independent.
As a representative, I will work to implement solutions to
improve our graduation rate and get our kids the resources they
need to do well in the classroom, stay interested in school, and
be prepared with trade skills or college if they choose.

As a legislator, **I will be a voice for Oregon!!**

**"WANT CHANGE? VOTE CYNTHIA HYATT!! SHE'S WORTH
THE VOTE!!"**

(This information furnished by Hyatt for Oregon House.)

State Representative, 17th District



Renee Windsor-White

Democrat
Progressive
Working Families

Occupation: Veterinary Chaplain, OSU Veterinary Teaching Hospital

Occupational Background:

Executive Assistant to the President, LBCC; Executive Assistant to the Dean, OSU Graduate School; Associate Regional Minister, Christian Church in Oregon

Educational Background: Master of Divinity, Yale Divinity School; Bachelor of Arts, Eureka College

Prior Governmental Experience: Lobbying for LBCC

The people of District 17 are facing issues that I believe I can speak to with authority, because I have faced them before.

FAMILY FARMING. I grew up on a family farm. Farming is a risky business. Many things must go right to have a good year, but only one thing has to go wrong for a bad year. Family farms should be protected from tariffs and trade wars. **RURAL LIVING.** I love living in a rural area. But big cities get all the attention. We need infrastructure decisions that help rural communities and Net Neutrality to ensure that we have fast internet connections at a reasonable price, for businesses, public and home schooling.

COMMON SENSE GUN LAWS. When I was 18, my mother was shot and killed. I do not hate or fear guns. I respect guns as tools that cause tragedy when they fall into the wrong hands. I want to work for common sense gun laws that will keep guns from falling into the wrong hands.

HEALTHCARE. I am a breast cancer survivor. That is a pre-existing condition for the rest of my life, although I've been cancer free for 10 years. I want to ensure that everyone has **comprehensive, affordable healthcare**, with no pre-existing condition restrictions.

PROTECTION OF SENIORS AND VETERANS. My husband is a wonderful man who was diagnosed with Alzheimer's and now lives in a care facility. If elected, I will do everything in my power to ensure that seniors, disabled veterans and their families, have the safety net of Medicare/Medicaid that they need and spent their lives paying for.

Please go to www.renee4OR17.org or email me at Renee.for.OR17@gmail.com

(This information furnished by Friends of Renee Windsor-White.)

State Representative, 17th District



Sherrie Sprenger

Republican
Independent

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, Commissioners' Appointment

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

Re-Elect Representative Sherrie Sprenger

A Steadfast Leader for a Prosperous Oregon

As our State Representative, Sherrie Sprenger will continue to be our voice in the legislature, taking our values and turning them into results. She is an effective leader for rural Oregon against powerful Portland interests.

Stimulate the Economy

As a former small business owner, Sherrie supports reducing government regulation and increasing incentives for small business creation.

Common Sense Budgeting

Sherrie has voted to fund the voters' priorities without new taxes, while streamlining services and agencies for more efficient production.

Improve Education

As a mother, Sherrie is a champion for safe, accountable and well-funded classrooms. She will continue to prioritize Oregon students to protect their future.

Keeping the Public Safe

Sherrie is a former rural Deputy Sheriff and she knows the importance of securing adequate funding for rural public safety

"I'm a Democrat voting for Sherrie Sprenger because she is strong and effective for our district. She is a straight shooter who doesn't play political games." Joyce Weatherly, Lebanon

"Our natural resources are a part of our past, present and future economic vitality. Sherrie Sprenger is a strong ally for us." Elizabeth Stutz, Feed Store Owner

"Sometimes you just need some help navigating the state system. Representative Sprenger's office is always available, friendly and helpful to the people in her district." Howard Ruby, Veteran - Sweet Home

www.SherrieSprenger.com

(This information furnished by Friends of Sherrie Sprenger.)



www.oregonvotes.gov

ORESTAR

The Oregon Elections System for Tracking and Reporting is a secure web-based application developed for campaign finance disclosure and enhanced to support candidacy and state voters' pamphlet filings.



Search ORESTAR

Find information about political committees registered in Oregon, campaign contribution and expenditure transactions, candidate filings for state offices and state voters' pamphlet filings by using ORESTAR's public search.

ORESTAR is available at:

➤ oregonvotes.gov

County Commissioner, Linn County, Position 1



**John K
Lindsey**

Republican

Occupation: County Commissioner

Occupational Background: Business owner, refrigeration, electrician, U.S. military

Educational Background:

Attended Lebanon Union High School, Linn-Benton Community College, Oregon State University, Naval School of Cryogenics

Prior Governmental Experience: Selective Service Board, Chairman of the Linn County Extension District, Has served on several federal and state commissions addressing forestry and land use. U.S. Navy, Oregon National Guard

Married to Linda, 3 children, Lifelong resident of Linn County.

John Lindsey - experienced on issues that matter to the citizens of Linn County

The Economy

John Lindsey continues to work with community leaders to bring investment, jobs and business to Linn County. This has resulted in hundreds of new jobs and millions of dollars of investment.

John Lindsey supported the creation of a small business youth mentoring program that has helped improve the work ethic of kids in our county while recognizing the hardships of small business in our communities.

Public Safety

“John Lindsey has been a proven advocate for public safety”

Tim Mueller, Retired Linn County Sheriff

John Lindsey will continue to oppose the state housing of felons in our communities instead of jail. Our kid’s safety comes first.

Veterans

John Lindsey has worked as a strong supporter of veterans. John has worked on legislation for our men and women in uniform and fought to get a veterans home built in Linn County.

Leadership

John Lindsey together with his fellow commissioners has led the state in saying enough is enough with out of state cash and lobbyist controlling state policy. The board has even taken legal action to protect the inerests of Linn County citizens. John always puts Linn County citizens first.

Community

John Lindsey has used the pay raise he recieved during the recession to sponsor scholarships for LBCC students. 14 scholarships have been awarded.

“ It has been an honor to serve you, the citizens of Linn County. I ask for your vote this November to continue our important work” **John Lindsey**

(This information furnished by john k lindsey.)

County Commissioner, Linn County, Position 1



**Gary
Sullivan**

Independent

Occupation: Retired.

Occupational Background: Construction Carpenter, Lumber mill worker

Educational Background: Linn Benton Community

College: Associate of Arts and Associate of General-Studies. Chemeketa Community College: Associate of Applied Science. Attended University of Copenhagen, studied International Peace and Conflict Resolution. Attended University of Colombo, studied Scientific Mathematics. Attended Fullerton College-JC, studied World Religions and Asian Civilization.

Prior Governmental Experience: N/A

The Two Major Parties Collude to Deceive and Manipulate Voters. My only agenda is to improve the human condition.

I am self-funding my grassroots campaign without the favors of special interest groups, publicists, mailings, yard signs or party oversight. I am not beholden to any special interest group or party. We all deserve equality.

If Elected I Will:

Always put people before business.

Be a strong advocate for property owners.

Never vote for a residential property tax lien foreclosure and eviction.

Inform the public about deceptive Bonds and Levies.

Propose changes to the property tax system to eliminate uncertainty and provide security through freehold ownership.

Refuse to support frivolous spending on expensive computer programs, advisors, or self-glorifying projects.

Eliminate discrimination and special privilege in county hiring.

Be available to mediate complaints to achieve fair resolutions.

Dedicate four years to achieve better living standards for everyone.

Politics Should Not Be a Private Club

As citizens we are obligated to participate, to always strive to advance the quality of life. If you don’t study the issues and vote based on your best judgement, or if you are telling yourself that you don’t have time or just don’t care, you’re leaving the game, letting special interest groups run your life and drive many of us into poverty.

I have lived in the same home in Liberty near Sweet Home for forty-three years. My property tax has increased to about one-thousand and three-hundred percent (1,300%). I have now paid more than one and one-half times as much in property tax as my original purchase price.

Thanks for your consideration,

Gary.

(This information furnished by Gary Sullivan.)

County Commissioner, Linn County, Position 1

Stephanie Newton

Democrat

Occupation: Small Business
Owner

Occupational Background:
Marketing consultant special-
izing in growing early-to-mid
stage businesses

Educational Background: B.S. Psychology - Utah

Prior Governmental Experience: Vice Chair - Human Relations
Commission; Captain - Neighborhood Watch

Community Involvement: Midsummer Arts (Board Member);
Albany Community Together (Emeritus Board Member); Girls
on the Run (Head Coach); Rural Oregon Progressives

Linn County Deserves Better

Dear Voter,

We need a commissioner who will fight for all of us. I speak everyday with families who are struggling to get by. I believe that no one who works full-time should be in poverty. Our neighbors deserve opportunities to succeed and leaders who treat everyone with respect. As a mother and small business owner, I have the experience to make sure that Linn County is a place where everyone can thrive.

I'm ready to fight for all of us.

As County Commissioner, I'll work to:

- make health care affordable and accessible for all
- invest in our roads to improve our commutes and keep our highways safe
- build new affordable housing because Linn County needs more front doors
- increase government transparency and reduce waste

This fall you have a choice and I humbly ask for your vote.

-Stephanie

Common Sense Stands with Stephanie:

"Stephanie is committed to transparent and accessible government. I applaud her for running and voters should elect her as Linn County Commissioner."

State Senator Sara Gelser

"Linn County needs someone who brings people together. Stephanie knows how to jump start small businesses, she'll be a real asset on the board of commissioners."

Albany Mayor Konopa

"Our local government should be accessible and easy to navigate. As a small business owner, I know Stephanie will help bring Linn County into the 21st Century."

Leanna Langley

Endorsements (partial list)

Congressman Peter DeFazio
Linn County Central Labor Council
Representative Dan Rayfield
Senator Lee Beyer
Mayor Don Ware
Councilor Dick Olsen
President of SOAR Rudy Hashberger

www.stephnewton.com

(This information furnished by Friends of Stephanie Newton.)

Judge of the Supreme Court, Position 5

Adrienne Nelson

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Judge of the Oregon Supreme Court

Occupational Background: Judge of the Oregon Supreme Court since January 2018; Judge of the Multnomah County Circuit Court (February

2006-January 2018); Senior Attorney/Coordinator - Portland State University Student Legal Services (2004-2006); Attorney - Bennett, Hartman, Morris and Kaplan LLP (1999-2004); Attorney - Multnomah Defenders, Inc. (1996-1999)

Educational Background: University of Texas School of Law, JD (1993); University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, BA (Summa Cum Laude) (1989)

Prior Governmental Experience: Prior experience listed above with the Oregon Supreme Court and the Multnomah County Circuit Court

EXPERIENCED. DEDICATED. RESPECTED. LEADER.

Before joining the Oregon Supreme Court, Judge Nelson served as a Multnomah County Circuit Court (trial) judge for almost twelve years. She has a deep commitment to the rule of law and, when making decisions, exercises sound legal reasoning with an open mind and in careful and thorough consideration of the issues, facts and law so that legal disputes can be fully and fairly heard, and everyone is treated with dignity and respect regardless of the outcome. Judge Nelson believes that our courts should be accessible to the citizens of Oregon. She will continue to fulfill her judicial responsibilities ethically, with integrity and in a way that creates public trust and confidence in our courts.

"Judge Nelson is a remarkable jurist. Her understanding of the rule of law is unmatched."

- **Paul J. DeMuniz, retired Oregon Supreme Court Chief Justice**

"Few Oregonians have left such an imprint on the Oregon justice system as Judge Adrienne Nelson. She is compassionate, fair and a keen listener."

- **Barbara Roberts, Oregon Governor (1991-1995)**

"Oregonians are fortunate to have such an outstanding individual as Judge Adrienne Nelson serving on our state's highest court. She is uniquely qualified by her intelligence, common sense and devotion to the rule of law."

- **Kerry Tymchuck, Executive Director, Oregon Historical Society**

(This information furnished by Committee to Elect Justice Adrienne Nelson.)

Judge of the Court of Appeals, Position 4

Robyn Ridler Aoyagi

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Judge, Oregon Court of Appeals

Occupational Background: Judge, Oregon Court of Appeals (2017-present); Attorney/Partner, Tonkon Torp LLP (2000-2017); Law Clerk,

D.C. Court of Appeals (1999-2000); Extern, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (1998)

Educational Background: Harvard Law School, J.D., 1999; Tufts University, B.A., 1995

Prior Governmental Experience: Judge, Oregon Court of Appeals

Recent Bar and Community Service: Board, Portland Story Theater, 2013-present; Chair, Oregon State Bar Appellate Practice Section, 2015; Executive Board, American Bar Association Council of Appellate Lawyers, 2015-2017; Region 5 Delegate, Oregon State Bar House of Delegates, 2010-2014

Experience, Dedication, and Impartiality

Judge Aoyagi brings to the bench nearly twenty years of legal experience. Her extensive knowledge of Oregon law is invaluable in tackling the complex issues presented to our courts. Her strong work ethic also suits her to one of the nation's busiest appellate courts. Since joining the Court of Appeals in July 2017, Judge Aoyagi has been productive and engaged.

Judge Aoyagi has a long record of service to the Oregon State Bar, local and national bar organizations, and local non-profit organizations. She is always ready to lend a hand to improve her community.

Judge Aoyagi decides every case impartially, based solely on the facts and the law, and treats all parties with respect. She has the credentials and the character for the job.

Candidate Statement

"Every Oregonian deserves a justice system that is transparent and fair. Behind every appeal, there are real people, and our decisions often have profound consequences for their lives. We must never lose sight of that in the work that we do."

"I am committed to impartial and unbiased application of the rule of law. I deeply appreciate the opportunity to work in public service and want to do my part to foster confidence in our judicial system. Although I am running unopposed, your vote matters to me. Thank you for the opportunity to do such meaningful work and serve my fellow Oregonians."

(This information furnished by Committee to Retain Judge Robyn Aoyagi.)

Judge of the Court of Appeals, Position 7



Steven R Powers

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Judge, Oregon Court of Appeals

Occupational Background: Judge, Oregon Court of Appeals; Attorney in private practice; Deputy General Counsel, Office of the

Governor; Deputy District Attorney, Multnomah County District Attorney's Office; Chairperson, Oregon Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision; Assistant Attorney General, Oregon Department of Justice; Petitions Law Clerk, Oregon Supreme Court

Educational Background: J.D., Willamette University College of Law; B.A., Western State College of Colorado (now known as Western State Colorado University)

Prior Governmental Experience: Oregon Court of Appeals Judge; positions listed above with the Office of the Governor, Multnomah County District Attorney's Office, Oregon Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision, Oregon Department of Justice, and the Oregon Supreme Court

Committed to the Rule of Law: Judge Powers is fair, impartial, and has a deep commitment to upholding the rule of law. Before joining the Oregon Court of Appeals, Judge Powers handled numerous civil, criminal, and administrative appeals before state and federal appellate courts, including the Oregon Court of Appeals, the Oregon Supreme Court, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and the Supreme Court of the United States.

Professional Activities and Community Service: Judge Powers has been an active member and volunteer with legal and civic organizations. He has been a panelist for continuing legal education programs on a wide range of subjects, served as a coach and volunteer judge for the Classroom Law Project, and mentored high school, undergraduate, and law students.

"It is an honor to serve as a judge on the Oregon Court of Appeals. I work hard each day to resolve disputes in a fair and impartial manner and to treat each case with respect knowing that these decisions have an impact on Oregonians across our state. I am grateful for your support."

--Judge Steven R. Powers

(This information furnished by Committee to Retain Judge Powers.)

Judge of the Oregon Tax Court



Robert Manicke

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Oregon Tax Court Judge

Occupational Background: Tax Attorney at Stoel Rives LLP in Portland for 22 years (1995-2017), specializing in state taxation. Began practice in San

Francisco (1992-1995) before returning to the Northwest.

Educational Background: JD, University of Illinois, with highest honors (1992). BA, Willamette University, with honors (1984). Graduated Centralia High School, Centralia Washington (1980).

Prior Governmental Experience: No service as a government official before his appointment as the Oregon Tax Court Judge in January 2018. However, as Chair of the Oregon State Bar Taxation Section Laws Committee from 2007 to 2017, Judge Manicke worked with lawyers, CPAs and the Department of Revenue to improve tax laws, rules and procedures. As Chair of the Taxation Section in 2013, he led changes that increased transparency in Section-wide elections.

Judge Manicke is deeply committed to the Tax Court's mission: ensuring access to a fair decision by an expert judge in state tax cases.

Expertise

Practiced tax law for 25 years, representing businesses, individuals, government entities and nonprofits. Judge Manicke was recognized as a leading state and local tax litigator in Oregon, and he consulted widely on Oregon tax legislation.

Impartial Decisions

Judge Manicke believes every party to a tax dispute deserves a fair hearing. As a practicing lawyer, he represented all kinds of taxpayers, tax-exempt organizations, and government entities. As judge, he is working to ensure that the law is applied fairly for everyone's sake.

Access

Judge Manicke believes everyone has a right to an efficient, workable process. He oversees the Tax Court's Magistrate Division, which uses informal rules and resolves 90% of the court's cases.

Community

Judge Manicke has held leadership roles with the German International School (twelve years), the Portland Symphonic Girlchoir (three years), the former Oregon Business Association (six years), and the Oregon Consular Corps and Scholarship Fund (four years). He volunteered as Germany's local diplomatic representative (five years), helping Oregonians and visitors with family and business connections to Germany.

(This information furnished by Committee to Retain Judge Manicke.)

Judge of the Circuit Court, 23rd District, Position 1

Michael Wynhausen

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Linn County Deputy District Attorney (DDA)

Occupational Background: Linn County DDA, 2005–Present; Benton County DDA, 1999–2005; Linn County DDA, 1997–1999; Union County DDA,

1996–1997

Educational Background: University of Oregon Law School, J.D. 1996; Santa Clara University, B.A. 1993

Prior Governmental Experience: Legislative Committee--Oregon District Attorney's Association; Vice President, Linn/Benton Bar Association, Faculty--National District Attorney's Association

Experience Matters

I've spent my career promoting public safety and offender accountability, while protecting the rights of crime victims. Over the last twenty-two years, I've had the unique opportunity to understand the difference between people who make a mistake and habitual criminals. I have the experience to recognize those who need help and those who need punishment.

I'm committed to the principle that every person who comes before the court has a right to be heard and treated fairly.

I've lived here for over twenty years, serving the citizens of Linn County for fifteen of those years.

I'm asking for your vote so that I may use that experience to serve the citizens of Linn County.

Supported by Linn County

Jim Yon | *Linn County Sheriff*

Tim Mueller and Bruce Riley | *Retired Linn County Sheriffs*

Doug Marteeny | *Linn County District Attorney*

Steve Doell | *Crime Victims United, President*

IBEW—Local 280 | *Drew Lindsey, Business Manager*

Frank Stevenson | *Chief of Police, Lebanon Police Department*

Linn County Deputy Sheriff's Association | *Todd Hargrove, President*

Albany Police Association | *Robert Hayes, President*

Lebanon Police Officers Union | *Justin Bach, President*

Sweet Home Police Officer's Association | *Christopher Wingo, President*

Andy Olson and Sherrie Sprenger | *State Representatives*

Will Tucker and John Lindsey | *Linn County Commissioners*

Honorable Rick McCormick | *Senior Judge, Linn County Circuit Court*

Honorable Jad Lemhouse | *Judge, Linn County Justice Court*

Carolyn Oakley | *Former State Representative*

Jay Burcham | *Burcham's Metals, Owner*

Robert Duncan | *Mayor of the City of Harrisburg*

Paul Aziz | *Mayor of the City of Lebanon*

Learn more at wynhausen.com

(This information furnished by Michael Wynhausen for Linn County Circuit Court Judge.)

Judge of the Circuit Court, 23rd District, Position 1

Fay Stetz-Waters

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Circuit Court Judge, Linn County

Occupational Background: U.S. Marine Corps; 911 Dispatcher; Oregon Department of Justice Law Clerk; National Crime Victims Institute Legal

Researcher; Legal Aid Services of Oregon Attorney; State of Oregon Administrative Law Judge; Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision Hearings Officer; OSU Equity Associate

Educational Background: Manchester Community College (1996-1999); Trinity College, B.A., History (2001); Lewis & Clark Law School, J.D. (2006)

Prior Governmental Experience: Oregon State Bar Lawyers for Veterans Executive Steering Committee; Family Law Advisory Committee, Juvenile Dependency Workgroup

Other Experience: Linn-Benton Bar Association Vice-President; Linn-Benton Women Lawyers President; Center Against Rape and Domestic Violence Board Member

RETAIN JUDGE FAY STETZ-WATERS

EXPERIENCE: Judge Stetz-Waters' life of service began when she enlisted in the Marine Corps. She later worked for twelve years as a 911 Dispatcher. Her legal career includes seven years of legal decision making as an Administrative Law Judge and Parole Board Hearings Officer. She currently serves as the Chief Family Law Judge for Linn County.

INTEGRITY: Judge Stetz-Waters is committed to the rule of law and to upholding our Constitution. She listens with respect to those who come before her and decides cases based on the facts and the law.

COMMUNITY: Judge Stetz-Waters is committed to keeping our community safe. As a Parole Board Hearings Officer, she held violent offenders, sex offenders, and repeat property offenders accountable. She recommended treatment for people suffering from addiction and mental health conditions. As a Judge, she supports families, treatment, and accountability.

Judge Fay Stetz-Waters has earned the support of:

Oregon Supreme Court Justices

Paul De Muniz, Chief Justice (*ret.*)

Richard Baldwin (*ret.*)

Rives Kistler

Adrienne Nelson

Oregon Court of Appeals Judges

James Egan, Chief Judge

Darleen Ortega

Linn County Circuit Court Judge Carol Bispham Hashagen (*ret.*)

Albany Mayor Sharon Konopa

Linn-Benton-Lincoln Central Labor Council

Oregon Steelworkers Legislative and Education Committee

For more information, please visit www.JudgeFayStetzWaters.com.

www.JudgeFayStetzWaters.com.

(This information furnished by Friends of Fay.)

Judge of the Circuit Court, 23rd District, Position 3



Rachel Kittson-MaQatish

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Partner, Morley Thomas Law

Occupational Background: Trial Attorney, Morley Thomas Law; Willamette Industries and Boise Cascade, Millworker.

Educational Background: Willamette University College of Law, Doctor of Jurisprudence; Oregon State University, Bachelor of Arts; Linn-Benton Community College; Sweet Home High School (1989).

Prior Governmental Experience: City of Lebanon Prosecuting Attorney; Linn County Civil Commitment Attorney; Linn County Arbitration/Mediation Commission; Intern Oregon House of Representatives; Teen Court Advisory Committee.

INVOLVED IN OUR COMMUNITY

- Co-Founder HeroHalf Marathon, honoring military and their families
- Co-Founder Willamette Street Law; teaching at-risk youth
- Optimist Club Member, past President
- *Pro bono* services for Center Against Rape and Domestic Violence
- Citizens Academy and high school guest lecturer
- Volunteer Coach

AWARDS AND HONORS

- Colleagues number one choice for this position
- LBCC Distinguished Alumni, 2017
- Lebanon Woman of the Year 2014
- Sweet Home Citizen of the Year 2014
- OSU Family Business Student of Excellence
- Scholarships: Ford Family Foundation Opportunity, Rotary, Dan and Daisy Ashton, LBCC, WUCL

ENDORSEMENTS

- Doug Marteeny, Linn County District Attorney
- Roger Nyquist, Linn County Commissioner
- Will Tucker, Linn County Commissioner
- Sherrie Sprenger, State Representative
- Hon. Jad B. Lemhouse, Justice of the Peace
- Hon. Paul De Muniz, Former Chief Justice Oregon Supreme Court

ADVOCATE FOR LINN COUNTY

I came from humble beginnings and overcame obstacles. This inspired me to become an attorney to help others. Linn County has blessed me and has been my home for most of my life. I owe a debt to Linn County for making my success possible.

I am a wife, mother, and grandmother. I have diverse legal experience and substantial courtroom experience in prosecution, family law, and mental health issues. I will work with others to strengthen families, protect children, protect our community, and reduce substance abuse. I promise to be a good listener, treat all with respect, apply the law fairly, and continue my decades of service to Linn County.

Work Ethic • Experience • Integrity • Community

Vote4Rachel.com

(This information furnished by Friends of Rachel.)

Judge of the Circuit Court, 23rd District, Position 3



Teri L Plagmann

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Trial Attorney

Occupational Background: Trial Attorney, Mediator, Small Business Owner, Court Appointed Special Advocate

Educational Background:

Lewis & Clark College of Law (Doctorate of Jurisprudence 1997), Oregon State University (B.S. 1993), South Albany High School (1988)

Prior Governmental Experience: Oregon Department of Agriculture, Internship

Community Involvement: Oregon School for the Deaf volunteer, Oregon State Bar Unlawful Practice of Law Committee, Oregon State Bar State Lawyer Assistance Committee, Board of Directors for Columbia Regional Programs, CARDV Courthouse volunteer, St. Andrews Legal Clinic volunteer, Albany Chamber of Commerce member

Teri Plagmann – The Best Choice for Judge

Experience

Teri Plagmann has 21 years of experience litigating cases in Linn County and other circuit courts throughout Oregon. Her broad background meets Linn County's need for a judge with both civil and criminal experience who can handle complex and every day issues with precision and effectiveness. She understands that safety is our number one priority.

Integrity

Teri Plagmann has spent her career representing real people who spend their hard earned money for solutions to real problems. She has a reputation for being fair, ethical and hard working. She stands by her principles and places the rule of law, the Constitution, fairness and equity above ideological beliefs. Her experience in mediation and in representing clients on both sides of cases brings impartiality, compassion and a practical approach to the courtroom.

Committed to Linn County

Teri Plagmann was born and raised on her family's grass seed farm near Albany, where she currently lives with her husband and children. Her family has resided in Linn County for over 100 years. Her deep roots in the community and depth of experience makes her the best qualified candidate for judge.

Endorsements include:

- Hon. James C. Egan, Chief Judge, Oregon Court of Appeals
- Robert McCann Jr., Healy & McCann, PC
- F. James Healy, Healy & McCann, PC
- Andy Ivers, Ivers Law Office, LLC
- Emerson Smoker Sr.
- Bill Case, Bill Case Farms, Inc.

(This information furnished by Teri L. Plagmann.)

Mayor, City of Albany

Sharon Konopa

Nonpartisan

Occupation: : Mayor of Albany

Occupational Background:
Event coordinator; small business 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 Mayor's Leadership Award for a large city; 2017 • State of Oregon Passenger Rail Leadership Council; 2011-14 • State of Oregon Public Transportation Plan Policy Advisory Committee; May 2016-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—20-year board member and current chair • Cascades West Economic Development District, serving Linn, Benton, Lincoln and Lane Counties; present • Community Development Commission, 2013-present • 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 20 years and President of the board.

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

- **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 a 22-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.com**

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

City Councilor, City of Albany, Ward I - A



Dick Olsen

Nonpartisan

Occupation: City Councilman Ward I Albany

Occupational Background: Chemical Engineer at Fed. Bureau of Mines, Albany Research Center 1966 to 1996

Educational Background: BA Pacific Lutheran U, 1959 PhD. Oregon State U. Chemical Engineering 1966

Prior Governmental Experience: Albany Councilman 1973 to 1978, Albany Mayor 1979-1980, Albany Councilman 1999 to present

Neighborhood rezoned from apartment house to single family	1971
Downtown Carnegie Library (built 1914) kept open	1973
Historic Monteith House (built in 1849) bought by City and pre-served	1974
Prevented urban renewal, designed to demolish & redevelop downtown	1979
Ambulance service returned to its rightful place in City Fire De-partment	1979
Three downtown historic districts formed	1980
Central School (built in 1915) preserved from demolition, see web story below	1980
Carnegie Library again kept open and endowment fund initiated	1990
Swanson Pool rebuilt and reopened as Cool Water Park	2005
Central School again saved from demolition and strengthened seismically	2005
New Fire Station opened	2018
Historic Carousel opened and operating	2018

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

Whats Important Now?

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.**

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 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 down town. **I'm it. Vote Olsen for City Council.**

I want to hear your concerns. E-mail me at rsolsen@proaxis.com or visit my web page at www.dickolsenforalbanycity-council.com

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

City Councilor, City of Albany, Ward II - A



Alex Johnson II

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Principal Agent & Member – TrueLife Financial Solutions, LLC

Occupational Background: 10.5 years United States Navy, ~5 years maintenance management at Hewlett-

Packard Company in Corvallis, ~3 years at Sr. Talent Manager at Agilent Technologies in Corvallis, ~7 years as Sr. Project Manager at Trimble Navigation in Corvallis, ~ 2 years as Director of Product Development at Fastrack Product Development in Corvallis and ~7.5 years as a Licensed Insurance Producer in Oregon. Founder of TrueLife Financial Solutions, LLC March 15, 2017.ackground:

Educational Background: Graduated from Central Union High School 1983. Studied Business Management at University of Phoenix.

Prior Governmental Experience: Veteran, United States Navy (Honorable Discharge) 5/1984 –11/1994

How I will serve the City of Albany and Ward II

- I will work with focus and purpose to ensure continuous improvement, scalability and sustainability of Albany's infrastructure and vital services to ensure a safe and family friendly Albany.
- I will engage and collaborate with all levels of Albany's government, business leaders and non-governmental organizations to ensure an inclusive healthy community for ALL of Albany's Citizens. I absolutely support the concept of Urban Renewal and affordable housing solutions.
- I will be accessible and accountable to Albany and Ward II's Citizen's during my time as your representative.
- I will serve as Ward II-A's voice on the Council on issues and matters offered to me by Ward II's Citizen's.
- I will strive to create fiscally responsible solutions, processes and systems to ensure our Citizen's feel safe and welcome in our Albany!

(This information furnished by Alex Johnson II.)

City Councilor, City of Albany, Ward III - A



Bessie Johnson

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Retired

Occupational Background: Operations Manager for bank, Assistant manager in retail, Tax Deputy for 22 years with Linn County.

Educational Background: Graduated Tripp High School, Tripp SD., banking courses at Dixie College in St George Ut, computer and various courses at Linn Benton Community College in Albany, Or.

Prior Governmental Experience: City of Albany Budget Committee, 15 1/2 years elected Albany City Councilor, member of Willamette Criminal Justice Council, liason to Albany Visitors Association and Fair/Expo committee

Bessie believes in:

- Property owner’s rights-Don’t overreach with codes
- Training for displaced or unskilled workers-Continue working with LBCC, the schools and the business community on the PIPELINE project. This program works to train, re-train and educate unskilled workers. Businesses and industry have said they have a difficult time finding the workers they need.
- Working with other organizations and municipalities to achieve common goals
- Doing everything possible to bring in new and to retain current businesses

I have been fortunate to be an elected City Coucilor for 4 terms. I have gained a lot of experience during this time. This experience allows me to look at each issue on it’s own merit, to weigh the alternatives and to make the best decision I can.

(This information furnished by Friends of Bessie Johnson.)

City Councilor, City of Albany, Ward III - A



Jessi Brenneman

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Business owner, Professional Dog Groomer

Occupational Background: Business Owner, Professional Dog Groomer

Educational Background:

Newberg High School, Diploma

Prior Governmental Experience: None

I love Albany! I moved to Albany in 2004 after marrying my caring, and supportive husband. 2004 was also the year I started my grooming business where I was greeted with open arms and big hearts from the community. 14 years later, I now have a thriving business and many clients I now consider friends and family. I would love this opportunity to give back to my community by serving the city as Councilor. Along with my strong work ethic, I have an open mind that listens to and can see every side of an issue. I respect folks from all walks of life and can learn something from every-one. My vision is to keep moving Albany along the path of progress, safety, and prosperity.

(This information furnished by Jessi Brenneman.)



Candidates pay for space in this pamphlet

Candidates who did not submit payment or signatures in lieu of payment with their statement by the deadline have an asterisk (*) following their name.

for more information about
voting in Oregon

 **oregonvotes.gov**



1 866 673 8683

se habla español

TTY 1 800 735 2900

for the hearing impaired

House Joint Resolution 201 – Referred at the 79th Legislative Assembly’s 2018 Regular Session to the Voters of the State of Oregon for their approval or rejection at the November 6, 2018, General Election.

Measure No.

102

Amends Constitution: Allows local bonds for financing affordable housing with nongovernmental entities. Requires voter approval, annual audits.

Estimate of Financial Impact	46
Text of Measure	47
Explanatory Statement	47
Legislative Argument in Support	48
Arguments in Favor	48
Arguments in Opposition	54

Ballot Title Caption

Amends Constitution: Allows local bonds for financing affordable housing with nongovernmental entities. Requires voter approval, annual audits.

Result of “Yes” Vote

“Yes” vote allows local governments to issue bonds to finance affordable housing with nongovernmental entities. Requires local voters’ approval of bonds, annual audits, public reporting.

Result of “No” Vote

“No” vote retains constitutional prohibition on local governments raising money for/ loaning credit to nongovernmental entities; no exception for bonds to pay for affordable housing.

Summary

Amends Constitution. The constitution currently prohibits most local governments from raising money for, or loaning credit to, or in aid of, any private entity. Measure allows local governments to issue general obligation bonds to finance the cost of constructing affordable housing including when the funds go to a nongovernmental entity. Measure requires that local authorizing bonds be approved by local voters and describe affordable housing to be financed. The jurisdiction authorizing bonds must provide annual audits and public reporting on bond expenditures. Measure limits jurisdiction’s bonded indebtedness for capital costs of affordable housing to one-half of one percent of the value of all property in the jurisdiction.

Estimate of Financial Impact

This measure amends Article XI, section 9 of the Oregon Constitution to allow local governments to issue general obligation bonds to finance the cost of constructing affordable housing when partnering with a nongovernmental entity. The measure also requires that proposed bonds be approved by local voters and the jurisdiction authorizing the bonds must provide annual audits and public reporting on bond expenditures.

There is no financial impact to state revenue or expenditures.

There is no financial impact on local government revenue or expenditures required by the measure. The revenue and expenditure impact on local governments is dependent on decisions by local governments to propose bonding for affordable housing and voter approval of the proposed bonds.

Committee Members:

- Secretary of State Dennis Richardson
- State Treasurer Tobias Read
- Katy Coba, Director, Department of Administrative Services
- Nia Ray, Director, Department of Revenue
- Debra Grabler, Local Government Representative

(The estimate of financial impact was provided by the above committee pursuant to ORS 250.127.)

Text of Measure

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

Paragraph 1. Section 9, Article XI of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, is amended to read:

Sec. 9. (1) No county, city, town or other municipal corporation, by vote of its citizens, or otherwise, shall become a stockholder in any joint company, corporation or association, whatever, or raise money for, or loan its credit to, or in aid of, any such company, corporation or association. [*Provided, that*]

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1) of this section, any municipal corporation designated as a port under any general or special law of the state of Oregon[,] may be empowered by statute to raise money and expend the same in the form of a bonus to aid in establishing water transportation lines between such port and any other domestic or foreign port or ports, and to aid in establishing water transportation lines on the interior rivers of this state, or on the rivers between Washington and Oregon, or on the rivers of Washington and Idaho reached by navigation from Oregon's rivers[; *any*].

Any debts of a municipality to raise money created for the aforesaid purpose shall be incurred only on approval of a majority of those voting on the question, and shall not, either singly or in the aggregate, with previous debts and liabilities incurred for that purpose, exceed one [*per cent*] **percent** of the assessed valuation of all property in the municipality.

(3) The prohibitions and limitations set forth in subsection (1) of this section do not apply to the use by a county, city, town or other municipal corporation of bonded indebtedness that is payable from ad valorem taxes not subject to limitation under section 11 or 11b of this Article to finance capital costs of affordable housing, but only if:

(a) The bonded indebtedness is approved by the majority of voters voting on the measure authorizing the bonded indebtedness at an election that meets the requirements of subsection (8) of section 11 of this Article, as modified by section 11k of this Article;

(b) The measure authorizing the bonded indebtedness describes "affordable housing" for purposes of the measure;

(c) The jurisdiction authorizing the bonded indebtedness provides for annual audits of and public reporting on the expenditure of proceeds of the bonded indebtedness; and

(d) The principal amount of the jurisdiction's bonded indebtedness outstanding for such purpose does not exceed one-half of one percent of the real market value of all property in the jurisdiction.

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

Some local governments have the authority to borrow money to buy or build affordable housing but they are limited in how that money can be spent. Specifically, the Oregon Constitution prohibits most local governments from raising money for, lending to or investing in a private company, corporation or other nongovernmental entity. Ballot Measure 102 amends Article XI, section 9, to add an exception for affordable housing. Under the measure, local governments may use bond proceeds to lend money to, invest in or pay a private company, corporation, or other nongovernmental entity for the capital costs to buy or build affordable housing.

In order to use this exemption, local governments must first obtain voter approval in an election in which the bond measure describes the "affordable housing" to be bought or built. The only bonds eligible for the exemption are those paid from new property taxes upon voter approval.

A local government that issues the bonds must provide public reporting on and annual audits of the expenditure of the borrowed funds.

Ballot Measure 102 caps each local government's total bonded indebtedness for capital costs of affordable housing at one-half of one percent of the real market value of all property in the local government.

Committee Members:
 Senator Ginny Burdick
 Representative Mark Meek
 Senator Alan Olsen
 Eric Winters
 Greg Chaimov

Appointed by:
 President of the Senate
 Speaker of the House
 Secretary of State
 Secretary of State
 Members of the Committee

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

Legislative Argument in Support

Measure 102 is a constitutional amendment that will help local communities throughout Oregon address the dire need for housing that is affordable.

We know that Oregonians are struggling. Rents and home costs are going up faster than wages, and it's harder and harder to make ends meet. Often, families and individuals are forced to make choices between paying the rent and putting food on the table.

Understanding the deep impact housing costs are having, community leaders are looking for opportunities to build and maintain housing that is affordable. This measure is one way we can all help, by removing a barrier in our constitution to the creation of affordable housing.

This constitutional amendment was approved by the Oregon Legislature on a strong bipartisan vote, and will allow local governments to partner with private businesses and non-profit organizations when building affordable housing with locally approved general obligation bonds. This will produce more long-term affordable housing for Oregon families.

Voting Yes will not raise your taxes. Local governments will need to ask residents to vote separately to approve any local bonds for affordable housing. Voting Yes will add a requirement that if any affordable housing bonds are approved in the future, they will be subject to annual audits and reporting.

We took the time to study this issue and were thoughtful about this recommendation. Rest assured, we don't take amending the constitution lightly. In fact, Lawmakers from communities across Oregon - from Baker City, Dundee, Bend, Springfield - joined together in support of this necessary change to make it easier for our communities to build affordable housing.

We urge a YES vote.

Committee Members:

Senator Ginny Burdick
Representative Mark Meek
Representative Mike Nearman

Appointed by:

President of the Senate
Speaker of the House
Secretary of State

(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

AARP Oregon Urges a YES vote on Measure 102

Too many Oregonians of all ages are struggling to make their rent or housing payments each month. Many of us remember when housing was affordable and contributed to financial security. But sadly today, housing costs are creating additional financial burdens for many of Oregon's families and retirees.

That is why AARP Oregon is encouraging all Oregonians to **vote yes on Measure 102**. This measure removes a critical obstacle to creating more affordable housing options in our communities. It would allow local governments, non-profits, and private organizations to work together using both public and private funds to create more affordable housing in Oregon - something governments and the private sector are prevented from doing under current law. If voters like us approve Measure 102, partnerships between government, non-profits, and the private sector would give Oregon the chance to increase the amount of funding used to build affordable housing for our seniors, veterans, and many of Oregon's families.

The Oregon legislature, in a bipartisan vote, referred Measure 102 to voters to make this simple, but important, change.

A YES vote on this measure will change things for the better—opening up opportunities to build even more affordable homes for Oregon's most vulnerable.

Trusted organizations around Oregon are strongly in support of this sensible change. AARP of Oregon is proud to be one of them. We studied this change and agree that it's simple, responsible, and an important step towards addressing our affordable housing crisis.

We ask that you please join us in voting yes on Measure 102 — for Oregon's older adults, veterans, families, and your community.

(This information furnished by Jonathan D Bartholomew, AARP Oregon.)

Argument in Favor

We work hand in hand with individuals and families who live and work in our communities and are struggling to make ends meet.

We urge you to vote YES on Measure 102.

Here are a few reasons why:

"Every day **Human Solutions** works with hundreds of vulnerable people impacted by the housing crisis who are struggling in this market to find and hang on to stable housing. It's past time to pull out all the stops to solve this crisis and **make sure that all of our fellow community members have a roof over their heads.** We enthusiastically support a Yes on Measure 102."

"Seniors are directly impacted by the steep increase in housing costs in our area and are often forced to make difficult choices between paying the rent/mortgage, heating their homes, and paying for food and medicine. **Meals on Wheels People** supports Measure 102 because **we believe seniors have the right to reasonably priced housing where they can live independently without making choices between basic needs.**"

"**211info** works in collaboration with partners to find solutions to Oregon's housing crisis. We get calls everyday from people who are struggling to find affordable places to live. We support Measure 102 to ensure that people have their basic housing needs met. **Better housing access leads to improved individual outcomes and community health.**"

"**Portland Homeless Family Solutions** believes **housing is a basic human right.** We can't accomplish our mission of helping homeless families with children get back into housing if we don't have enough homes for them to live in."

211info

Bradley Angle

Community Vision

HomePlate Youth Services

Human Services Coalition of Oregon

Human Solutions

INCIGHT

Meals on Wheels People

National Association of Social Workers Oregon Chapter

Northwest Pilot Project

OnTrack Rogue Valley

Oregon Developmental Disabilities Coalition

Outside In

Partners for a Hunger-Free Oregon

Portland Homeless Family Solutions

Tillamook County Community Action Resource Enterprises, Inc. (CARE)

Transition Projects

(This information furnished by Karl Rohde, INCIGHT.)

Argument in Favor

The League of Women Voters of Oregon Urges Your Support

YES for Affordable Housing – YES on Measure 102

The League has long advocated for decent, safe, and affordable homes for everyone, with an emphasis on those most in need. This November we can give our communities the flexibility they need to address Oregon's affordable housing crisis.

Here is how Measure 102 works:

- The amendment would remove an outdated restriction in the Oregon constitution that prevents affordable housing bond dollars from being used in partnership with non-profit or local business interests.
- Local jurisdictions would be granted the authority to seek voter approval for bonds to be used for the purpose of developing affordable housing in their communities. Any local bond measure would establish the level of affordability based on local needs.
- This small change would allow local governments to bring together local community members, business leaders, non-profit advocates and local elected officials to develop effective strategies to increase the supply of affordable housing based on their own community's needs.
- **The voters in local jurisdictions will have the final say on approving affordable housing bond measures.**
- This measure is a small change to Oregon's constitution, something the League considers carefully before supporting, but removes a large barrier to progress on ensuring adequate and affordable housing for Oregon families.
- This measure was referred to voters by a bipartisan group of legislators with an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

Measure 102 empowers communities by enabling them to address homelessness and affordable housing needs --problems that are affecting all corners of our state.

Please vote YES for affordable housing by November 6.

(This information furnished by Norman Turrill, President, League of Women Voters of Oregon.)

Argument in Favor

Before I lived in an apartment in Southeast Portland, I was living in my car, with my dog Jenny. We would stay in a Walmart parking lot in Gresham, because there was nowhere else to go.

Before that, I had been taking care of my elderly mother. After she passed away, I couldn't find an affordable place to live myself. We were homeless for about six months.

A friend called different apartment buildings for low-income people to help me find a place in Portland. She found that the Ritzdorf in the Buckman neighborhood had an opening, and urged me to apply.

One day the non-profit that manages these apartments called—there was a space for me and Jenny.

I feel so lucky—so blessed—to find a place to live. It's like heaven. These apartments are simple, and nice. I have neighbors who were in similar situations before finding a home at the Ritzdorf. They all love Jenny.

The building I live in was built by REACH Community Development, in partnership with the City of Portland's economic development agency. Voting YES on Measure 102 would allow partnerships like this to use locally-approved bond funding to provide even more homes. Funding for affordable housing can be complicated; Measure 102 makes it easier.

There are thousands of Oregonians like me who are waiting for a safe, stable place to live. Measure 102 will help local jurisdictions build more apartments like the Ritzdorf.

Please vote YES on Measure 102 this November.

—Murray Ruhland

(This information furnished by Megan M Wever, Yes for Affordable Housing.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon AFSCME Supports Measures 102

Housing is an issue facing every working person in the state of Oregon. The members of Oregon AFSCME are no different. As working Oregonians they are not immune to the housing crisis. It is also clear that we need a statewide solution because workers from every corner of Oregon are struggling to tackle this problem. We believe that Measure 102 will help communities to maximize their local ability to create more affordable housing. As Oregon grows we need to make sure that Oregonians are not pushed out of their homes and we create new housing that meets the demand for all income levels. This measure allows for partnerships between private non-profits and local governments or the state to share resources in order to build more affordable housing.

Whether it's our corrections members in Eastern Oregon, or members from OHSU in Portland, the problem is the same. Our members are telling us we need to support solutions. Current law limits local governments from working with housing non-profits to create partnerships to build affordable housing. This measure fixes that, and will allow those partnerships. That will allow voters to decide locally on how to invest and build affordable housing for their residents. This measure is just one step in the process but it is an important one.

Join our members from across the state in supporting this measure and create more housing for everyone in Oregon.

Vote Yes on 102

(This information furnished by Joseph E Baessler, Oregon AFSCME.)

Argument in Favor

Businesses and business leaders are proud to support Measure 102

"Ensuring an adequate supply of affordable housing in Oregon is a preeminent workforce issue and a long-term priority of the business community. We are proud to support this collective effort knowing that it will have broad positive impacts on our economy and the stability of Oregon families." - Oregon State Chamber of Commerce, representing 80 local Chambers of Commerce and more than 24,000 local businesses in every corner of Oregon.

The housing affordability crisis threatens the resiliency of our communities and the vibrancy of our cities and counties. **It's a problem that touches all of us—and one that we need to solve together.**

Businesses and business leaders are proud to support Measure 102 and say YES! to a small change that will lead to more affordable homes and allow public dollars to go further. We believe that our employees should be able to live and thrive in the neighborhoods where they work. Affordable housing is critical to realizing these deeply held values—for our employees and customers, and for all Oregonians.

This amendment was referred to the ballot by a strong bipartisan vote of the Oregon Legislature. It also requires local voter approval, annual audits and public reporting to ensure accountability.

Measure 102 is a common sense measure that maximizes local affordable housing efforts. We're voting YES. Please join us.

Beaverton Chamber of Commerce

Business for a Better Portland

Hillsboro Chamber

North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce

Oregon Home Builders Association

Oregon Smart Growth

Oregon State Chamber of Commerce

Portland Business Alliance

Portland Timbers & Thorns

Westside Economic Alliance

(This information furnished by Nathaniel R Brown, Portland Business Alliance.)

Argument in Favor

Join us in voting YES on Measure 102 for affordable housing

Rising rents and home prices are a problem in communities across Oregon. As we seek solutions, we must maximize the impact of any public investments in affordable housing.

Measure 102 is a simple and sensible change that will make affordable housing dollars go further by allowing local governments to partner with non-profit and private housing providers. This measure is the most effective and efficient way to leverage public investments in affordable housing.

Trusted organizations from every corner of Oregon urge your support of Measure 102.

1000 Friends of Oregon
Oregon Center for Public Policy
211info
Oregon Coalition of Christian Voices
AARP Oregon
Oregon Developmental Disabilities Coalition
American Federation of Teachers - Oregon
Oregon Education Association
American Tiny House Association - Oregon
Oregon Environmental Council
Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO)
Oregon Food Bank
Basic Rights Oregon
Oregon Home Builders Association
Bus Project
Oregon Housing Alliance
Children First for Oregon
Oregon League of Conservation Voters
Coalition of Communities of Color
Oregon NOW
Community Action Partnership of Oregon
Oregon Nurses Association
Community Partners for Affordable Housing
Oregon Primary Care Association
Democratic Party of Oregon
Oregon Rural Health Association
Fair Housing Council of Oregon
Oregon School Employees Association
Fair Shot for All
Oregon Smart Growth
Family Forward Oregon
Oregon Society of Physicians Assistants
Habitat for Humanity of Oregon
Oregon Working Families Party
Human Services Coalition of Oregon
Pacific Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters
International Association of Firefighters Local 43
Partners for a Hunger-Free Oregon

IBEW Local 48
Partnership for Safety and Justice
League of Oregon Cities
Portland Business Alliance
League of Women Voters of Oregon
Progressive Oregon
Meals on Wheels People
SEIU 503 & 49
National Association of Social Workers Oregon Chapter
Sierra Club Oregon Chapter
Neighborhood Partnerships
Street Roots
Network for Oregon Affordable Housing
UFCW Local 555
Oregon AFL-CIO
Urban League of Portland
Oregon AFSCME
Welcome Home Coalition

(This information furnished by Alison McIntosh, Oregon Housing Alliance.)

Argument in Favor

COMMUNITIES ACROSS OREGON ARE UNITED IN SUPPORTING MEASURE 102

Earlier this year, the Oregon Legislature took a **near-unanimous and bipartisan vote** to refer an amendment to voters this November that would remove an outdated restriction in the Oregon constitution that prevents local affordable housing bond dollars from being used in partnership with non-profit and private affordable housing developers.

This amendment, Measure 102, will allow taxpayer dollars spent on affordable housing bonds to go further through additional investments, including federal resources and public-private partnerships, helping more people access housing in Oregon communities that pass affordable housing bonds.

There is no additional cost to taxpayers from this sensible change, but it would ensure our tax dollars go further.

Across Oregon, many small cities wouldn't be able to implement an affordable housing bond program without this change. This amendment will allow cities and counties of all sizes to consider a bond to build housing that people who live and work in our communities can afford.

Join us in voting YES. Oregonians are counting on us.

League of Oregon Cities

Beaverton City Council

Bend City Council

Benton Board of Commissioners

Corvallis City Council

Eugene City Council

Hood River City Council

Medford City Council

Milwaukie City Council

Portland City Councilors

Salem City Council

Tigard City Council

Tillamook County Commission

Wilsonville City Council

(This information furnished by John L Cook, Mayor of Tigard.)

Argument in Favor

**WE CARE ABOUT OREGON'S CHILDREN
SO WE ARE VOTING YES ON MEASURE 102**

As teachers, educators, and advocates for children, we see the impact of the affordable housing crisis everyday. Children are hit especially hard by the lack of affordable housing in our communities.

There are more than 23,000 students experiencing homelessness across Oregon—and they live in every corner of our state. Across Oregon's school districts, 23,312 students experienced homelessness and severe housing instability during the 2016-2017 school year. From bigger more urban districts like Beaverton and Salem-Keizer, to smaller rural communities like Butte Falls in Jackson County, or Port Orford-Langlois in Curry County—160 of Oregon's 197 school districts served homeless students last year.

Unaffordable Housing = Instability for Students

For families forced to wait for shelter and permanent homes, their kids don't get the sleep they need and can't get to school on time or regularly. They fall behind and are at greater risk of dropping out.

Even for students whose families have housing, unaffordable rent can cause instability and disrupt learning. Parents must work multiple jobs to keep a roof over their family, or sacrifice on other basics, like food, clothing and medicine.

Measure 102 is a simple change that will unlock the full potential of local housing investments, creating and preserving more homes that are permanently affordable, while reducing the strain on low-income families and students.

Vote YES for affordable housing. Vote YES on Measure 102.

- American Federation of Teachers-Oregon
- Children First for Oregon
- Oregon Education Association
- Oregon School Employees Association
- Safe Routes to School National Partnership

(This information furnished by Chris Coughlin, Children First for Oregon.)

Argument in Favor

Measure 102 means flexibility to build more affordable homes in our communities

As Oregon's leading affordable housing builders and advocates, we are doing everything possible to provide homes for people who live and work in our communities. Many of us have affordable apartments designed and ready to build — but **pulling together the funding is a puzzle, and we don't always have all the pieces.** In fact, Oregon leaves federal housing dollars unspent each year because we don't have the local matching funds needed to unlock those federal resources.

Why? Oregon's constitution prohibits local jurisdictions from working with affordable housing developers to build homes with bond funds. The constitutional ban means local governments must own and control any housing built with bonds, and cannot use bond dollars to leverage other resources — like federal dollars — to build affordable housing.

Put another way: when we're putting together the puzzle to build new affordable housing, we can't use local bonds to finish the picture. Measure 102 would change that, giving local jurisdictions more flexibility while ensuring accountability.

"Public and private sector cooperation has been key to creating more affordable housing over the past 30 years. Non-profit and for-profit builders have a proven track record working with local, state and federal government to create long-term affordable housing. Measure 102 would allow local bond funds to be used in the same way and would create more affordable housing for Oregonians." — Dan Valliere, REACH Community Development

Vote YES on Measure 102 by November 6 to make an impact.

- BRIDGE Housing
- CASA of Oregon
- Community Housing Fund
- Community Partners for Affordable Housing
- Enhabit
- Fair Housing Council of Oregon
- Hacienda CDC
- Housing Development Center
- Housing Oregon
- Human Solutions
- Innovative Housing, Inc.
- NEDCO
- Neighborhood Partnerships
- Network for Oregon Affordable Housing
- Northwest Housing Alternatives
- Oregon Housing Alliance
- Portland Housing Center
- Proud Ground
- REACH Community Development
- Rose Community Development
- Sponsors, Inc.
- Washington County Thrives
- Welcome Home Coalition
- Willamette Neighborhood Housing Services

(This information furnished by Alison McIntosh, Oregon Housing Alliance.)

Argument in Favor

Affordable housing leads to healthier people

That's why health providers from across the state support Measure 102 for affordable housing.

With rent and home costs on the rise, too many families face uncertainty and struggle to make ends meet. No one should have to make impossible choices between rent or groceries or be forced from their communities and schools. We see the negative health consequences of those realities everyday.

Providence's Center for Outcomes Research and Education conducted a study in February 2016, looking at Medicaid-covered residents who moved into one of 145 different affordable housing properties. Here's what they found:

- Costs to health care systems were 12% lower after people moved into affordable housing.
- Emergency department visits went down by 18% after move in. Primary care visits went up by 20%.
- Forty percent of residents reported that access to care improved by moving into affordable housing, and 38% reported that their quality of care improved.

The evidence is clear: Affordable housing is good for people's health and good for our communities.

Measure 102 empowers local jurisdictions around the state to stretch the impact of public dollars on the affordable housing crisis. With this change to current law, communities around the state will be able to ensure safe, affordable housing for those who need it most — working families, seniors, veterans and people with disabilities.

- Advanced Health
- AllCare Health
- Oregon Health Equity Alliance
- Oregon Nurses Association

CareOregon	Oregon Primary Care Association
Cascade AIDS Project	Oregon Rural Health Association
Cascade Health Alliance, Inc.	Oregon Society of Physicians Assistants
Central City Concern	Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon
Coalition for a Healthy Oregon (COHO)	Southern Oregon Health Equity Coalition
Coalition of Oregon Professional Associations for Counselors and Therapy	Trillium Community Health Plan
Kaiser Permanente	Virginia Garcia Memorial Health Center

Northwest Health Foundation

(This information furnished by Catie Theisen, Oregon Nurses Association.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon's Thriving Tourism Industry Supports Measure 102

Hospitality workers make our thriving tourism industry possible. For every dollar we invest in tourism promotion, \$237 comes back to Oregon in visitor spending—in addition to \$11 in local/state tax revenues for important community priorities—according to third party research by Longwoods International. However, restaurant and lodging employees from Ashland to Portland, Coos Bay to Bend, are finding it more difficult to find housing close to their place of work.

Due to rising housing costs, these hard-working Oregonians are finding it more difficult to secure housing options that meet their needs. The result is long distance and congestion-filled commutes that mean less time spent with families and more money spent on transportation. Hard-working Oregonians should be able to afford to live near their job, but a lack of affordable housing options across the state is making that more difficult.

Across Oregon, there is an opportunity to lift the ban on public-private housing development partnerships that assist in solving the challenges we face. Support for Measure 102 will give local governments the opportunity to create comprehensive workforce housing proposals and present them for consideration to local voters. We believe communities deserve the right to vote on housing proposals that, if planned appropriately, can stimulate local economic growth while adding to the quality of life for hospitality workers and their families.

Measure 102 is an important, bipartisan measure that will give communities across Oregon greater flexibility to create the housing they need. By allowing local governments to partner with non-profit and private housing providers, any bond dollars they raise specifically for affordable housing will be able to go further, creating more affordable homes. This measure is a small tweak that will have a big impact in the lives of Oregonians. Please join us in voting yes for Measure 102.

Oregon Restaurant & Lodging Association

(This information furnished by Jason Brandt, Oregon Restaurant & Lodging Association.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon's working people urge you to vote YES on Measure 102 to keep our workforce strong

Hard-working Oregonians should be able to afford a place to live. Right now, there is not enough housing that working people can afford. Measure 102 will allow local governments to partner with non-profit and private affordable housing developers to create more permanent, affordable homes.

Measure 102 is vital to keeping Oregon families and communities healthy and together.

Voters have the opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to creating prosperous, thriving communities for everyone. This measure ensures:

- Locally-approved affordable housing investments can go approximately 50% further, creating and preserving more affordable homes for working families, seniors, and people with disabilities.
- For example, a bond on the ballot this November in the Portland metro region could help as many as 12,000 people if Measure 102 also passes. Without Measure 102, about 7,500 people will be helped.
- This amendment was referred to the ballot by a bipartisan majority in the Oregon legislature. Annual audits and public reporting are required to ensure accountability.

Our unions represent over 425,000 working Oregonians in both the public and private sectors. We support Measure 102 and we ask that you also vote YES on Measure 102.

American Federation of Teachers - Oregon

IBEW Local 48

International Association of Firefighters Local 43

Oregon AFL-CIO

Oregon AFSCME

Oregon Education Association

Oregon Nurses Association

Oregon School Employees Association

Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council

Pacific NW Regional Council of Carpenters

SEIU 503

SEIU Local 49

United Food & Commercial Workers Local 555

(This information furnished by Catie Theisen, Oregon Nurses Association.)

Argument in Favor

OREGON'S FOOD BANKS AND COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES URGE A YES VOTE ON 102

Oregon's food banks and community action agencies are on the front lines of our state's affordability crisis. We help people make ends meet with food assistance, utility bill payments, and child care referrals—and when things get really tough, emergency shelter options.

Every day, we see working people with full-time jobs paying more than half their income on housing, leaving little for other necessities like food and medicine. We see parents who are forced to skip meals so they can make sure their family has a safe place to call home. We assist seniors on fixed incomes that aren't keeping pace with rapidly rising rents. They all turn to us—their local food pantries and community action agencies—for help.

And as long as housing costs continue to rise faster than wages it will only get worse. As a community, we must do better, or we risk losing what holds us together.

That's why we're urging you to vote YES on Measure 102—because having a roof over your head is key to holding down a job, staying healthy, doing well in school, and keeping families together.

Measure 102 is a simple solution. It will allow local governments to partner with non-profit and private builders to increase affordable housing options with voter-approved bonds.

It costs nothing. But it will let communities that want to build or preserve affordable housing reach even more people in need.

Oregon's food banks and community action agencies urge you to please vote YES on Measure 102.

Oregon Food Bank

Community Action Partnership of Oregon

Community Action serving Washington County

Community Action Team, Inc.
(Columbia, Clatsop and Tillamook Counties)

FOOD for Lane County

Marion-Polk Food Share

Oregon Coast Community Action
(Coos and Curry Counties)

United Community Action Network
(Douglas and Josephine Counties)

Yamhill Community Action Partnership

(This information furnished by Anneliese E Koehler, Oregon Food Bank.)

Argument in Favor

OREGONIANS STRUGGLE TO PAY FOR THE MOST BASIC NECESSITIES, SUCH AS SHELTER.

MEASURE 102 WILL HELP LOCAL COMMUNITIES ADDRESS OUR AFFORDABILITY CRISIS, AND BUILD MORE HOMES FOR PEOPLE WHO NEED THEM MOST.

Oregon has a growing housing crisis:

- Since 1980 housing prices in Oregon have risen by 315%, making it 4th in the nation for housing price increases.
- Over half of all renters in Oregon pay more than 30% of their income to housing, leaving too little to cover needs like food and transportation.
- Children under 5 years old have the highest poverty rate of any age group, with 1 in 5 living in poverty.
- In Oregon, the Fair Market Rent for a 2-bedroom apartment is \$1,105. In order to afford this without spending more than 30% of income on housing, a minimum wage earner must work 79 hours per week, 52 weeks per year.

Cities and counties throughout the state are considering housing bonds to take steps to address the affordable housing crisis in our state—this measure will strengthen those efforts.

Measure 102 won't raise taxes. It will enable local communities with housing bonds to create even more safe and permanent affordable housing during this time of need.

Join Habitat for Humanity affiliates across Oregon and **VOTE YES on Measure 102** for more affordable housing.

Habitat for Humanity of Oregon

Albany Area Habitat for Humanity

Coos County Habitat for Humanity

Habitat for Humanity La Pine Sunriver

Habitat for Humanity Portland/Metro East

Junction City/Harrisburg/Monroe Habitat for Humanity

Lebanon Area Habitat for Humanity

McMinnville Area Habitat for Humanity

Newberg Area Habitat for Humanity

North Willamette Valley Habitat for Humanity

Sisters Habitat for Humanity

West Tuality Habitat for Humanity

Willamette West Habitat for Humanity

(This information furnished by Megan Parrott, Habitat for Humanity of Oregon.)

Argument in Favor

State Leaders Urge a YES Vote on Measure 102

Working families across Oregon are struggling to afford safe and stable housing. Communities need flexibility to address their own unique housing needs. Measure 102 provides that flexibility.

These days, Democrats and Republicans don't agree on much. But one thing we do agree on is voting YES on Measure 102.

The Oregon Legislature referred this amendment to the ballot with **broad, bipartisan support** to give local communities as many tools as possible to address their housing affordability needs.

Voting YES on Measure 102 means:

More housing can be built with the same taxpayer investment.

With this change, bond dollars for affordable housing that have been approved by voters will build more homes for people that need them, making a larger impact. This means we're getting more bang for our buck when it comes to building affordable housing that people throughout our state need.

Dollars for affordable housing will be spent as efficiently and effectively as possible.

Cities and counties can make those dollars go further by combining federal tax credits and other resources. Just as important, this change means local governments can partner with the people who know how to build affordable housing -- non-profits and businesses who are the experts.

Voting YES on Measure 102 will not raise your taxes.

Local governments will need to ask residents to vote separately to approve any local bonds for affordable housing. Voting YES on Measure 102 will add a requirement that any affordable housing bonds approved in the future require annual audits and reporting.

This is a small change that will have a big impact for Oregon families.

That's why there's statewide, bipartisan support for Measure 102.

Join us by voting YES on Measure 102.

Senator Peter Courtney, Senate President
Representative Tina Kotek, Speaker of the House

(This information furnished by Tina Kotek, Speaker of the House, Oregon Legislature.)

Argument in Opposition

Initiative Petition 102 asks the voters to change Section 9, Article XI of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, to allow counties, cities, towns, or other municipal corporations to obtain “bonded indebtedness that is payable from ad valorem taxes not subject to limitations under section 11 and 11b of this Article to finance capital cost of affordable housing”.

What this means in laymen’s terms is the jurisdiction can borrow money, using your property as collateral, to build “affordable housing”. “Affordable housing” is an important cause, but it is not defined in this legislation. That definition is left up to the borrowing agency, hence, each different jurisdiction can have their own definition of “affordable”.

Voters will be able to vote for or against the bonding, but they will not know at the time of the vote, what terms or conditions are placed on the money to be distributed by the jurisdiction, nor will they know how repayment of this funding will be handled. Will it reduce the bonded indebtedness, or will it go into the General Fund of the jurisdiction?

One must also consider that when the “affordable housing” is built, the jurisdiction benefits by an increased tax base and by thousands of dollars that will be collected through the System Development Charges on this “affordable housing”.

How is your housing made any more affordable, when your property taxes will increase, outside the limits of Measure 5 and Measure 50, that we, the voters passed?

Do you want your city or county to become the local bank, loaning out money that you are required to pay back, so a private developer can reap the profits?

The housing crisis is linked to the lack of affordable building land and huge system development charges, all created by the same governments.

Representative Barbara Smith Warner (D) stated, “You don’t change the Constitution without knowing what you are going to get”. How true!

Please vote no on this Initiative.

(This information furnished by Alan Olsen.)

Proposed by initiative petition to be voted on at the General Election, November 6, 2018.

Measure No.

103

Amends Constitution: Prohibits taxes/fees based on transactions for "groceries" (defined) enacted or amended after September 2017

Estimate of Financial Impact	55
Text of Measure	56
Explanatory Statement	57
Arguments in Favor	57
Arguments in Opposition	63

Ballot Title Caption

Amends Constitution: Prohibits taxes/fees based on transactions for "groceries" (defined) enacted or amended after September 2017

Result of "Yes" Vote

"Yes" vote amends Constitution; prohibits state/local taxes/fees based on transactions for "groceries" (defined), including those on sellers/distributors, enacted/amended after September 2017.

Result of "No" Vote

"No" vote retains state/local government authority to enact/amend taxes (includes corporate minimum tax), fees, on transactions for "groceries" (defined), including on sellers/distributors.

Summary

Amends Constitution. Currently, state/local governments may enact/amend taxes/fees on grocery sales, including state corporate minimum tax, local taxes. Measure prohibits state/local governments from adopting, approving or enacting, on or after October 1, 2017, any "tax, fee, or other assessment" on sale/distribution/purchase/receipt of, or for privilege of selling/distributing, "groceries", by individuals/entities regulated by designated food safety agencies, including restaurants, or operating as farm stand/farmers market/food bank. Measure prohibits "sales tax, gross receipts tax, commercial activity tax, value-added tax, excise tax, privilege tax, and any other similar tax on sale of groceries." "Groceries" defined as "any raw or processed food or beverage intended for human consumption." Alcoholic beverages, marijuana products, tobacco products exempted. Other provisions.

Estimate of Financial Impact

The financial impact is indeterminate.

Committee Members:

Secretary of State Dennis Richardson
State Treasurer Tobias Read
Katy Coba, Director, Department of Administrative Services
Nia Ray, Director, Department of Revenue
Debra Grabler, Local Government Representative

(The estimate of financial impact was provided by the above committee pursuant to ORS 250.127.)

Text of Measure

Whereas access to food is a basic need of every Oregonian; and

Whereas keeping the price of groceries as low as possible improves the access to food for all Oregonians; and

Whereas taxing the sale of groceries hurts low- and fixed-income Oregonians; now, therefore,

The People of the State of Oregon find that the sale of groceries shall remain tax free and the State of Oregon or any political subdivision shall not tax the sale of groceries.

To that end, the Constitution of the State of Oregon is amended by creating a new section 16 to be added to and made a part of Article IX, such section to read:

Section 16. (1) Subject to the limitations in subsection (4) herein, the state and a city, county, district or other political subdivision or municipal corporation of this state may not adopt, collect, enact, or impose a tax, fee, or other assessment upon the sale or distribution of groceries or for the privilege of selling or distributing groceries.

(2) Nothing in subsection (1) of this section limits the authority to adopt, collect, enact, or impose:

(a) A tax, fee, or other assessment on or measured by:

(A) The sale of alcoholic beverages, marijuana products, or tobacco products.

(B) Net income of an individual or entity.

(b) A fee or other assessment to operate the State Department of Agriculture's Food Safety Program or Commodity Inspection Program or any successor agency or program that provides for the safety of groceries.

Definitions

(3) As used in this section:

(a) "Groceries" means any raw or processed food or beverage intended for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, marijuana products, and tobacco products.

(b) "Sale or distribution of groceries" means any transaction for the sale, purchase, distribution, or transfer of groceries sold, distributed, transferred to, or purchased, or received from, any individual or entity that:

(A) Is licensed, registered, or inspected under the Food Safety Modernization Act, U.S. Food and Drug Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture Federal Grain Inspection Service, or any successor agency or program that provides for the safety of groceries; or

(B) Is licensed and inspected by the State Department of Agriculture's Food Safety Program or Commodity Inspection Program or any successor agency or program that provides for the safety of groceries; or

(C) Operates as a farm stand, farmers market, or food bank.

(c) "Tax, fee, or other assessment" includes, but is not limited to, a sales tax, gross receipts tax, commercial activity tax, value-added tax, excise tax, privilege tax, and any other similar tax on the sale of groceries.

(d) "Alcoholic beverage" means any liquid or solid containing more than one-half of one percent alcohol by volume and capable of being consumed by a human being.

(e) "Marijuana product" means a product made from any part of the plant Cannabis family Cannabaceae or the seeds of the plant Cannabis family Cannabaceae.

(f) "Tobacco products" means cigars, cigarettes, cheroots, stogies, periques, granulated, plug cut, crimp cut, ready rubbed, and other smoking tobacco, snuff, snuff flour, moist snuff, cavendish, ping and twist tobacco, fine-cut and other chewing tobaccos, shorts, refuse scraps, clippings, cuttings and sweepings of tobacco, and other kinds and forms of tobacco, prepared in such manner as to be suitable for chewing or smoking in a pipe or otherwise, or both for chewing and smoking.

Implementation

(3) The prohibition on the imposition and collection of a tax, fee, or other assessment, including but not limited to a corporate minimum tax, on the sale or distribution of groceries by subsection (1) of this section applies only to state and local enactments relating to taxes, fees, or other assessments adopted, approved, or enacted on or after October 1, 2017.

(4) It is the intent of the people that all parts of this amendment are independent and that if any part of this amendment is held unconstitutional, all remaining parts shall remain in force.

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

Explanatory Statement

Ballot Measure 103 would add a new section 16 to Article IX of the Oregon Constitution prohibiting the state or any local government from adopting, approving, or enacting on or after October 1, 2017, any tax, fee, or other assessment on any transaction for the sale, purchase, distribution, or transfer of "groceries," or for the privilege of selling or distributing "groceries." This change to the Oregon Constitution will result if 50 percent plus one or more of the votes cast on the measure are "yes." Once approved, changes to the Oregon Constitution can only be made by popular vote, not by the Legislature.

Under current law, the state and local governments could choose to tax "groceries." The measure defines "groceries" as any raw or processed food or beverage intended for human consumption. Items not intended for human consumption are not "groceries" as defined by the measure. The measure would allow new or changed taxes or fees for the sale or distribution of such items. "Groceries" does not include "alcoholic beverages," "marijuana products" or "tobacco products," as those terms are defined by the measure.

The measure does not prohibit a tax or fee on or measured by the net income of an individual or entity, or any fee collected for the purpose of operating certain programs of the State Department of Agriculture.

The measure prohibits taxes, fees, and assessments on the purchase or sale of raw or processed food or beverage intended for human consumption at all stages, including agricultural crops and food and beverage products of all types, whether in warehouses, transit, packaging and processing plants, certain restaurants, or other locations, when the commodity, product, facility, establishment, or commercial activity is regulated under specified federal or state food safety programs.

The prohibited taxes and fees include any sales tax, gross receipts tax, commercial activity tax, value-added tax, excise tax or privilege tax and any change in the corporate minimum tax, to the extent that the corporate minimum tax is imposed on Oregon sales of groceries.

Committee Members:	Appointed by:
Dan Floyd	Chief Petitioners
Joe Gilliam	Chief Petitioners
Cyreena Boston Ashby	Secretary of State
Representative Barbara Smith Warner	Secretary of State
Bruce Bishop	Members of the Committee

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

Argument in Favor

Measure 103 Protects Oregonians

The Oregon Restaurant & Lodging Association (ORLA) supports Measure 103 because it protects low-income Oregonians and small businesses, including restaurants, from new taxes on the sale or distribution of food and beverages, regardless of where such items are purchased.

Measure 103 specifically defines "groceries" as "any raw or processed food or beverage intended for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, marijuana products, and tobacco products." This broad definition includes food and beverages purchased from restaurants.

Taxes on food would have a disproportionate effect on Oregonians who can least afford it, including low-income households and seniors on fixed incomes. While many states other than Oregon have sales taxes, many exempt food and beverages from those taxes for this very reason. Measure 103 protects all Oregonians from regressive and harmful taxes imposed by state and local governments on the sale of food and beverages.

Oregon currently does not have any statewide sales tax but many local governments tax certain items. Measure 103 would ensure that if new state or local sales taxes are passed in Oregon, those taxes will not apply to the sale of food and beverages. Measure 103 protects customers and businesses from the negative affects new taxes on food and beverages would have.

A meal at a restaurant or from take-out is a regular and increasing part of many Oregonians' busy schedules. ORLA supports Measure 103 because it will ensure that such meals remain as affordable as possible without unnecessary and burdensome taxation.

(This information furnished by Jason Brandt, Oregon Restaurant & Lodging Association.)

Argument in Favor

Kyle Camberg, Executive Director of Sunshine Division

Encourages a YES vote on Measure 103 – To Keep Groceries Tax Free!

Since 1923, the Sunshine Division has been providing food relief to Portland area families and individuals in need. Whether due to the loss of a job, domestic crime, illness, economic challenges, or victims of disaster, the Sunshine Division has built a 95-year legacy of mobilizing quickly and efficiently to assist families and individuals in crisis.

We still have too many hungry throughout Oregon.

That's why I strongly support Measure 103 – To keep groceries tax free.

A sales tax on groceries would make it even more difficult for struggling families to put food on their tables. The number of families served annually by the Sunshine Division has doubled since the recession and we're reminded daily that rising costs of living and housing are making it more difficult for many Oregonians to get by.

That's why Measure 103 is needed. It ensures there can be no future attempts to tax groceries and hurt struggling families.

And Measure 103 specifically ensures grocery stores, food banks and food pantries will remain Tax Free.

Keeping the cost of basic necessities such as groceries as low as possible and tax free is critical to the thousands of families and individuals across our state that live paycheck to paycheck and have razor thin margins within their monthly budgets. More than half a million Oregonians face food insecurity on a daily basis, the potential for taxing groceries would be a step backward in our goal to fight hunger and would cause a burden many households could simply not bear.

Measure 103 is a step forward in our shared goal of fighting hunger in Oregon.

That's why I'm voting YES on 103 and strongly urge every voter to vote YES on 103 too.

Vote YES on 103 to help fight hunger in Oregon – and to keep YOUR groceries tax free!

(This information furnished by Kyle Camberg, Sunshine Division.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon Small Business Association Recommends Voting YES on Measure 103

Our groceries should never be taxed – Measure 103 guarantees that.

The business of getting food to your family's table includes thousands of Oregon small businesses.

Each of these mostly family owned and operated companies will benefit from the guarantee Measure 103 brings – that Oregon politicians will no longer be able to threaten families and businesses with a tax on groceries.

While Measure 103 does not cut any current tax, it ensures there will be no future tax on the sale of groceries in Oregon. That's great – and that's why OSBA is urging its members and all Oregon voters to vote YES on Measure 103.

Small businesses in Oregon have faced continuous threats of higher taxes by state and local politicians, especially the threat of a tax on sales. It's been a constant battle. But with Measure 103, we're taking the taxing of groceries sales out of that tax potential – from farm to fork.

This allows the thousands of small businesses in Oregon the opportunity to better plan for their future and hopeful expansion, knowing they won't be forced to pass along a sales tax to their end customers – Oregon families working to put food on their table.

Voting YES on Measure 103 benefits us all. Please join OSBA and its member small businesses in voting YES on Measure 103.

About OSBA - The Oregon Small Business Association is dedicated to promoting a positive business environment through education, research, lobbying and legal action on the federal, state, county and local level.

(This information furnished by TJ Reilly, Oregon Small Business Association.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon Family Farm Association Endorses a YES Vote on Measure 103

Keep YOUR Groceries Tax Free from Our Family Farm to Your Fork

The Oregon Family Farm Association is dedicated to protecting the heritage of Oregon's family farm.

We know just how vulnerable family farms are in Oregon.

One more tax and we'll lose even more.

That's why Measure 103 is so important to family farms – and to your family.

Oregon has never taxed groceries, but not for the lack of trying by the politicians and political power brokers. They've tried 5 times in just the last 3 years.

If any one of those taxes had passed, it would have been the final generation for hundreds of family farms. And it would have meant struggling families would be even more at risk from issues with hunger.

Taxing groceries is just a terrible idea.

By voting YES on Measure 103 – we will make sure the politicians and political brokers can never tax our groceries. Doesn't that just make sense?

Who could possibly oppose Measure 103?

Simple, the special interests that have been trying year after year to tax groceries!

Their continued efforts to tax our groceries makes the case for Measure 103 – and why we need to vote YES on Measure 103 to make sure our groceries will always be tax free.

A YES vote on Measure 103 means more family farms will survive to the next generation.

For the sake of the tradition of the Oregon family farm, please vote YES on Measure 103.

(This information furnished by Matt Cyrus, Oregon Family Farm Association.)

Argument in Favor

Taxpayers Association of Oregon Says "ABSOLUTELY YES!" to Measure 103

The Taxpayers Association of Oregon is the watchdog for all Oregon taxpayers, working to oppose higher taxes and poor tax policies.

TAO has fought a constant battle against a sales tax in Oregon – and so far, we've won.

But Oregon's Politicians and Special Interests keep trying, coming up with new and inventive ways to back door a sales tax. They call it a gross receipts tax or a corporate minimum tax, but it's all the same – a tax in sales is a sales tax. Any tax on sales will ultimately be paid by the families of Oregon.

One of the worst tax grab ideas TAO continues to fight is a tax on groceries. No tax hurts the working poor worse than a tax on groceries – the basic need for all Oregon families. In spite of this, the most powerful political organizations keep trying to tax groceries – 5 efforts in just the last 3 years.

That's why Measure 103 is necessary and why TAO absolutely recommends a YES vote.

Measure 103 does not cut or raise any current tax. Rather, it ensures Oregon will never have a future tax on groceries. That just makes sense.

The Power Brokers opposing Measure 103 have one thing in common – they have tried to tax your groceries - and they will try again. But by passing Measure 103, Oregon will become the 5th state to permanently block a grocery tax.

*To protect Oregon's taxpayers,
To protect Oregon's struggling families,
To protect Oregon's small farms and businesses,
To protect Oregon's farmer's markets, food banks and food pantries,*

Taxpayers of Oregon recommends an "ABSOLUTELY YES!" vote on Measure 103.

Keep updated on Oregon tax news at OregonWatchdog.com (since 1999)

(This information furnished by Jason D Williams, Executive Director, Taxpayer Association of Oregon.)

Argument in Favor**Promise King, President of the Oregon League of Minority Voters****Urges a YES vote on Measure 103 – To Keep Our Groceries Tax Free**

The Oregon League of Minority Voters is dedicated to empowering minority voices in community and government, as well as serving as a liaison between communities of colors, policy leaders and institutions.

Measure 103 Keeps Groceries Tax Free

Voting YES on Measure 103 is something we all should be able to agree on, because taxing groceries is simply an awful idea. Communities of color too often disproportionately face food insecurity. Putting a tax on groceries would only make matters worse for these communities. But with Measure 103, the grocery tax is permanently prohibited.

Measure 103 Helps Combat "Food Deserts"

Communities of color also disproportionately face challenges from "food deserts" where whole neighborhoods may not have a single grocery store.

While Measure 103 does not reduce or increase any current tax, it does ensure there will be no future tax on groceries at either the wholesale or retail level. Blocking these future taxes, can help encourage new grocery stores to open where none now exist.

And Measure 103 blocks an increase in the tax paid by grocers who are barely breaking even or losing money - the corporate minimum tax. These mostly smaller, independent grocery stores are also more often located in inner cities and rural communities. Raising the corporate minimum tax on these grocers could easily mark their last day in business and lead to communities of color being further underserved or simply not served at all.

Vote YES on Measure 103 to Help Your Neighbors and Your Own Family

Please vote YES on Measure 103 to help your neighbors who may be struggling with food insecurity. Or vote YES on Measure 103 to help your own family.

A YES vote on 103 guarantees our groceries in Oregon will always be tax free. Now that's something that benefits everyone in our communities.

(This information furnished by Promise King, Oregon League of Minority Voters.)

Argument in Favor**Oregonians for Food & Shelter Endorse a YES Vote for Measure 103**

Food for our families. Could anything be more important? That's why Oregon has never taxed groceries. And to keep it that way we urge a YES vote on Measure 103.

But incredibly, the most powerful special interests in Oregon want to tax food sales. And they keep trying nearly every year to do so.

That's why Oregon voters should vote YES on Measure 103, so Oregon can become the 5th state to ensure groceries are never taxed.

The opponents of Measure 103 have proposed taxing groceries when sold from the farmer to the producer, from the producer to the distributor, from the distributor to the grocery store, and from the grocery store to you.

That's 5 times they want your food taxed before it gets to your table. Can you imagine what that would do to the price of groceries you buy?

Let's be clear – the farmer, the producer, the distributor, and the grocery store will continue to pay the same taxes they are today. Measure 103 raises no taxes and cuts no taxes. That's been confirmed by the Oregon Department of Justice. And 103 specifically states the Oregon Legislature can raise or reduce any corporate income tax based on profits – that doesn't change either.

By voting YES on Measure 103, we take away the ability of the politicians and special interest to put a new tax the sale on groceries – the kind of tax most readily passed on to consumers.

Voting YES takes a grocery tax off the table – that makes it easier to put food on your table.**For your family and every family in Oregon, please vote YES on Measure 103.**

Oregonians for Food and Shelter is non-profit coalition to promote the efficient production of quality food and fiber while protecting human health, personal property and the environment.

(This information furnished by Sandra Wilken, Oregonians For Food & Shelter.)

Argument in Favor**Media Outlets Around Oregon Are Saying YES to Measure 103****Bend Bulletin, June 21 2018 – "Ban on food tax is good for all Oregonians."**

"Oregonians will be asked to vote this fall on a constitutional amendment that would prevent the Legislature from taxing the sale or distribution of food.

It's a no-nonsense approach to help hold food costs down in this state.

The chief benefit is for people who buy food. And the benefit is not unprecedented.

Many states that do have sales taxes do exclude food. Oregon does not have a sales tax.

"Measure 103 will help keep food costs in check for all Oregonians, rich or poor."

Daily Astorian, July 25, 2017– "Grocers right to be concerned about tax."

"Grocers are going on the offensive long before a predicted tax battle begins, and it's probably a good thing."

"The initiative would prohibit taxes at every point of food sales, from production, processing, wholesale and retail, with the exception of meals served at restaurants."

"Food is a necessity and shouldn't be taxed."

KOHI Radio, August 15, 2018 – "All of Oregon should follow St Helen's lead ban and grocery taxes."

"When you start taxing groceries, you start telling people living on fixed incomes what they can and or can't afford to eat. A grocery tax means government has gone too far"

"All of Oregon should follow St Helen's lead and ban grocery taxes by voting YES on Measure 103."

Measure 103 permanently bans the politicians from taxing your groceries. Politicians and special interests have tried 5 times in the last 4 years. That's why Measure 103 is so important to your family – to every Oregon family.

Vote YES on 103 to Keep YOUR Groceries Tax Free!

(This information furnished by Sandra Wilken, Yes! Keep Our Groceries Tax Free!)

Argument in Favor

PLEASE VOTE YES ON MEASURE 103 – TO KEEP YOUR GROCERIES TAX FREE!

As advocates for a hunger-free Oregon and longtime board members of the Oregon's statewide food bank, we understand how too often families struggle to put food on their tables. It's heartbreaking to see.

That's why we're proud to be the Chief Petitioners for the **"YES on 103 – To Keep Our Groceries Tax Free!"** campaign.

We have never taxed groceries statewide in Oregon, and we never should. Voting YES on 103 ensures that we never will.

There have been many recent attempts by the politicians and power brokers throughout Oregon to tax our groceries – by the State Legislature and by local politicians. Taxing groceries is a terrible idea, but these politicians keep trying.

Attempts to tax our groceries statewide include:

- House Bill 2330 (2017)
- Senate Joint Resolution 18 (2015)
- Initiative Petition 21 (2017)
- Measure 97 (2016)

And local efforts include in Ontario with Measure 23-58 (2018) and in St Helens (2017).

That's why we need a YES vote on Measure 103.

Measure 103 cuts no tax and imposes no tax. Corporations and individuals will pay the same tax they do currently. The impact on 103 is solely prospective.

A YES vote on Measure 103 will prospectively and permanently prohibit Oregon politicians from ever taxing our groceries. A NO vote will continue to allow the politicians to try to tax our groceries – and they will.

Voting YES on 103 to keep our groceries tax free is in keeping with our Oregon history, values and desires. Most importantly, it protects the most vulnerable in our society – families struggling to put food on their table.

Please join us and other advocates fighting hunger in Oregon by voting YES on Measure 103 – Let's permanently keep our groceries tax free!

Ron Brake, Co-Chief Petitioner

Syd Hannigan, Co-Chief Petitioner

(This information furnished by Syd Hannigan, Yes! Keep Our Groceries Tax Free!)

Argument in Favor

Voting YES on 103 Protects Oregon's Struggling Small Farms & Grocery Stores

The Power Brokers and Politicians can be very tricky, especially when they're after your money.

In the last five years, special interests, local politicians, and Legislators have tried to pass hidden sales taxes on groceries to pay for their pet projects.

Here's a perfect example – for years the politicians have used a hidden sales tax on businesses that do not make a profit. It is the so-called "Corporate Minimum Tax" (CMT) and it applies to struggling farms and grocery stores. It could be called the **"You didn't make any money, but we want to tax you anyway - tax."** The politicians have tried 4 times in 3 years to raise the CMT – so far, thankfully unsuccessfully.

The CMT is a tax on the annual sales of a business, but only applies when a business doesn't make a profit and doesn't pay any income tax.

If the politicians were successful in raising the CMT struggling farms and grocery stores could be wiped out. Most of us have seen the food deserts in rural communities and urban neighborhoods where grocery stores have gone out of business.

Measure 103 blocks future tax increases based on the sale of food and beverage for human consumption.

Measure 103 does not eliminate or repeal any corporate tax. Corporations will pay the same before and after Measure 103.

Measure 103 explicitly allows current and future taxes based on grocery store profits.

Taxing grocery sales raises food prices, punishes small businesses and farms, and hurts families struggling to put food on their table.

Let's protect Oregon's struggling small farmers and grocers - especially as so many are found in rural communities - and low-income inner-city neighborhoods.

Vote Yes on Measure 103 and keep the groceries on your family's table tax free!

Joe Gilliam is the President of the Northwest Grocery Association, which represents grocers throughout Oregon.

(This information furnished by Joe Gilliam, President, Northwest Grocery Association.)

Argument in Favor

Protect Yourself from a Grocery Tax by Voting YES on 103

5 times in 4 Years They've Tried to Tax Groceries –

THAT'S WHY WE NEED MEASURE 103

Now opponents to Measure 103 will say anything to stop 103- because it stops them from taxing your groceries.

Here's a list of falsehoods they'll likely repeat in their ballot arguments below.

FALSE: Measure 103 impacts the Bottle Bill.

This is wrong and they know it. Asked specifically, **The Oregon Beverage and Recycling Cooperative** on July 31st clearly stated:

"OBRC would like to clarify, as stewards of the Bottle Bill, that our analysis shows no impact on the Bottle Bill from Ballot Measure 103."

FALSE: Measure 103 hits Medicare and the gas tax.

This is wrong and they know it. Asked specifically, **The Tax & Finance Section of the Oregon Department of Justice** on July 26th clearly stated:

"Our conclusion is that the limitations of IP 37 (Measure 103) would not apply to those assessments or taxes. IP 37 (Measure 103) does not appear to apply to either the new hospital assessment or the new gas tax."

FALSE: Measure 103 is a corporate tax break:

This is wrong and they know it. According to the official draft statement on July 16th by the **Financial Estimate Committee:**

"The Initiative does not reduce existing state or local government tax or fees, nor does it require any additional state or local government spending to implement."

What the opponents of 103 are saying is 100% objectively FALSE, according to the government agencies that make these decisions.

So why would these political organizations continue to say things already proven false? Because they want to tax your groceries and a YES vote on Measure 103 won't let them.

A YES vote on Measure 103 proactively ensures the politicians will never be able to tax your groceries, without specific state-wide voter approval.

Vote YES on 103 – To keep YOUR groceries tax free.

(This information furnished by Sandra Wilken, Yes! Keep Our Groceries Tax Free!)

Argument in Favor

There are two sides to Measure 103.

VOTING YES: Those that want to ensure our groceries in Oregon are always tax free.

Saying NO: Politicians, Power Brokers and Special Interests that want to tax your groceries....*and have tried repeatedly for years.*

Does the "No on 103" coalition look familiar? It should.

It's nearly identical to the coalition that tried to put a tax on groceries in 2016 with Measure 97.

...and tried to tax groceries again in 2017 with Initiative Petition 21.

...and again in 2017 with House Bill 2330.

...and again in 2015 with Senate Joint Resolution 18.

You can compare for yourself and see the Pro-Grocery Tax/ Anti-103 connection at www.NoOn103.com.

Thankfully these efforts to tax your groceries all failed. But they'll be back. They will keep trying...year after year...to tax our groceries.

And they'll say almost anything to get a grocery tax. Even things already proven false by the OBRC and the Oregon Department of Justice.

You can see the OBRC's memo of July 31st and Oregon Department of Justice's letter of July 26th, for yourself at www.VoteYESon103.com/JustTheFacts.

The powerful No on 103/Pro-Grocery Tax coalition might be the **BEST** reason to vote YES on 103.

Because by voting YES on 103, we permanently bar the politicians and these power brokers from ever taxing our groceries in Oregon, without specific statewide voter approval.

Without 103, the strongest political powers will continue to try to tax the groceries of the weakest – vulnerable families and seniors struggling to put food on their table.

Voting YES on 103 takes an Oregon grocery tax off the table – and that makes it easier to put food on the table.

By voting YES on 103 you will ensure YOUR groceries will always be tax free.

It's amazing who that angers.

(This information furnished by Sandra Wilken, Yes, Keep Our Groceries Tax Free!)

Argument in Favor

Chambers of Commerce Statewide Urge a YES Vote on Measure 103

Let's keep Oregon groceries tax free!

Feeding people is a critical part of our Oregon economy. We literally can't live without it.

From farms, to food processing, to grocery stores, these businesses work on some of the smallest of margins. Adding a tax on their sales – as has been repeatedly tried in recent years – means the choice of passing the costs to struggling families or being unable to stay in business.

That's why taxing groceries is such a bad idea and why voting YES on Measure 103 is so important.

Measure 103 will neither cut nor increase any current tax. Businesses in Oregon will pay the same. It proactively blocks future taxes on food sales, ensuring Oregon's groceries from farm to fork will remain sales tax free, as they have been since statehood. That's good for struggling families and small margin businesses alike.

Chambers of Commerce throughout Oregon representing tens of thousands of Oregon's small businesses, nonprofits, community organizations and citizens urge a YES vote on Measure 103.

Oregon State Chamber of Commerce

North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce

Roseburg Area Chamber of Commerce

Klamath County Chamber of Commerce

Tualatin Chamber of Commerce

Albany Area Chamber of Commerce

Molalla Area Chamber of Commerce

The Dalles Area Chamber of Commerce

Hermiston Chamber of Commerce

(This information furnished by James L Wilson, Oregon State Chamber of Commerce.)

Argument in Favor

For Veterans and Active Military Families

Keeping Our Groceries Tax Free Is Important

Vote YES on Measure 103 – Keep Our Groceries Tax Free

The families of service men and women face real sacrifices, whether stationed at home, deployed overseas, or retired. Not only are their loved ones often away from home, their household incomes can be stretched – especially amongst reservists called up to duty.

That's why Military veterans are voting YES on 103 – to keep tax free my family's groceries and the groceries of other military families in Oregon. And for all Oregonians.

Oregon has never had a statewide tax on groceries, for good reason. A grocery tax is regressive and hurts worst those families that are having a hard time putting food on their tables. Too many times retired Veterans are among those struggling with food insecurity issues. A grocery tax would make it even harder – it's just a bad idea.

That's why we need Measure 103, to make sure we will never have a tax on groceries in Oregon.

Voting YES on Measure 103 takes away the ability of the politicians to tax our groceries. And it's about time, because time and again the politicians keep trying to tax our groceries.

Let's protect our groceries from being taxed.

Let's protect the families of men and women sacrificing to protect us.

Let's all vote YES on Measure 103 – so we can count on our groceries always being tax free.

Alisha Hamel, LTC (Ret.) Army National Guard and Gulf War Veteran

David Warden, Navy Veteran

Jered Melton, Navy Veteran

Henry Hearley, Navy Veteran

Thomas Jenkins, Navy Veteran

Brad Brunhaver, SSgt USAF (Disabled Veteran)

Brett Ward, Navy Veteran

Thomas Brandt, Navy Veteran

Ronnie C. Matous, Navy (Retired)

William Brandon Douglas III, Army Veteran

Josh Miller, U.S> Navy Veteran

Nicholas Kuster, Navy Veteran

Chad Saunders, Navy Veteran

Steven Hung, Navy Veteran

Jerel Ancheta, Navy Veteran

Thomas Ahlberg, Navy Veteran

(This information furnished by David Warden, United States Navy Veteran.)

Argument in Favor

**Voting YES on Measure 103
Will Keep YOUR Groceries Tax Free**

From our farms and ranches to your family's table

The farming and ranching communities of Oregon urge all Oregon voters to vote YES on Measure 103 – to keep our groceries tax free!

Since statehood, Oregon has never had a tax on groceries – and we never should. Measure 103 guarantees we never will.

But just two years ago, powerful special interests pushed for a tax on sales of 2.5%, including on groceries. Worse yet, this tax would have hit every step in getting food to your table –

When the farmer sold to the packager.

When the packager sold to the distributor.

When the distributor sold to the grocery store.

When the grocery store sold the groceries to your family.

That would have significantly raised the price of your family's groceries.

Thankfully, that effort failed. But the same special interests came right back and tried again last year. And they'll try again next year, unless we pass Measure 103.

That's why Measure 103 is so important. It takes a tax on groceries off the table – and that makes it easier for Oregon families to put food on their table.

Measure 103 doesn't raise taxes and it doesn't cut taxes. With the passage of Measure 103, Oregon farmers and ranchers will continue to pay income taxes, property taxes and a myriad of other taxes and fees. We will pay no more and no less in taxes if Measure 103 passes.

Measure 103 proactively ensures there will be no future tax on grocery sales – just as it's been in Oregon since statehood.

Please help ensure we always keep groceries tax free in Oregon – from our farms and ranches to your family's table.

Please vote YES on Measure 103 – To Keep YOUR Groceries Tax Free!

Oregon Farm Bureau

(This information furnished by David M Dillon, Oregon Farm Bureau Federation.)

Argument in Opposition

I'm a grocery store owner, and I'm voting No on Measure 103.

- The measure blocks small businesses from getting a break on many taxes and fees
- It locks huge and risky problems into our Constitution forever
- It would hurt Oregon businesses and families, all to enrich special interests and big corporations

As a grocery store owner, I know first-hand just how important it is to provide our customers with high quality food at an affordable price. But Measure 103 wouldn't do anything to help keep grocery costs down for the families that shop at my store; instead, it would pad the pockets of the special interests and big businesses pushing this measure.

The bottom line is that Measure 103 would hurt Oregon small businesses like mine. Measure 103 would permanently freeze many fees and taxes that small businesses like mine pay, meaning they could never be raised or **lowered**. That's right — this measure actually **prevents** small businesses from ever being able to get any tax relief on a wide variety of taxes and fees. That's not fair, and it's not healthy for the future of Oregon's small businesses.

All of these problems would be locked into our Constitution and nearly impossible to change if Measure 103 passes. It's also worth noting that **there is NO tax on groceries, and I've never heard of anybody proposing one** — I should know, food and groceries are my business. So what we would be stuck with is a pointless measure that doesn't solve any existing problems, but creates a huge list of new problems.

Small businesses like mine deserve thoughtful public policy that helps us create good-paying jobs and grow Oregon's economy. Measure 103 would be a huge setback, and it has no business going into Oregon's constitution forever. I hope you will stand with Oregon small business owners and VOTE NO on Measure 103 this November.

Sincerely,

Nicholas O'Neil

Cherry Sprout Produce

North Portland

(This information furnished by Thomas K Adamson, Vote No on 103: 103 is Bad for Business.)

Argument in Opposition

GET THE FACTS: NEWSPAPERS REPORT THAT MEASURE 103 IS A HUGE RISK

In newspapers across Oregon, reporting has shown that Measure 103 is a flawed and risky change to the state constitution that will be nearly impossible to fix later on.

Deceptive and misleading

"... the simple-sounding measure gets cloudier when you look into how it might play out. Given the proposal's definition of "groceries" and "sale or distribution," state officials have said the proposal would have widespread effects ... "

-- Oregon Public Broadcasting, June 8, 2018 (1)

Locks long-lasting problems into Oregon's constitution

"Writing tax law by constitutional amendment can have unintended consequences. Fixing those problems can be both time consuming and difficult."

-- Bend Bulletin, June 21, 2018 (2)

Could lead to taxes on diapers, medicine, and other household items

"Backers of the proposal have acknowledged that the measure still allows taxes on other basic necessities such as diapers, medicine and feminine hygiene products, ... "

-- Portland Tribune, June 20, 2018 (3)

Rolls back healthcare and transportation funding

"... the measure would extend far beyond the grocery aisles into restaurant booths, theater seats and Oregon's can and bottle redemption centers. It would affect an assessment on hospital revenues voters enshrined in January and could even impact how much the state can collect to repair roads and highways."

-- Oregon Public Broadcasting, June 8, 2018 (4)

Hurts Oregon small businesses

"Measure 103 would also exempt grocers from any future increase in Oregon's corporate minimum tax. It would put supermarkets in a separate category from other businesses in the state."

-- The Oregonian, July 28 (5)

Citations:

(1) <https://www.opb.org/news/article/oregon-grocery-tax-measure-impact-supporters-opponents/>

(2) <https://www.bendbulletin.com/opinion/6328071-151/editorial-ban-on-food-tax-is-good-for>

(3) <https://portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/398988-294000-ban-on-food-taxes-would-be-a-first>

(4) <https://www.opb.org/news/article/oregon-grocery-tax-measure-impact-supporters-opponents/>

(5) https://www.oregonlive.com/business/index.ssf/2018/07/measure_103_ban_on_grocery_tax.html

(This information furnished by Thomas K Adamson, Vote No on 103: Protect Oregon's Constitution.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 103 hurts the farmers that need help the most — Vote No

If you believed the TV commercials and mailers you get around this time of the year, farmers (and veterans and seniors, too) would be getting help from every politician and every measure. We'd be living high-hog.

But the truth is: People are always pretending to help farms in Oregon succeed, but they rarely actually do anything.

Measure 103 is a perfect example: They say it'll help farmers and small businesses, but the lobbyists who wrote it accidentally made it so my taxes will be locked into the Constitution forever.

That means, if politicians finally figure out a plan to help small business owners, farmers will be one of the only groups that won't be able to benefit — ever.

That means we can never get a break, so we can never lower prices on the crops we sell. But guess who will get a new break: the mega-farm titans in our industry that already control so much of the market that it's hard to compete, which makes it harder for us to keep our doors open and sustain our families year after year.

That's why farmers are calling on Oregonians to vote No on 103.

Measure 103 presents Oregonians with a choice: Do we want to support our family farmers, the ones that have built the Oregon we know and love? Or do we want to turn over our agriculture to a few big guys that can cut corners to make money?

I know what I choose.

We can't let out-of-state giants ruin family farmers just so they can have their own special loophole.

Please join me in voting No on Measure 103.

Farmers across the state are counting on you.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Nigel and Carys Wilkins
Sisters, Oregon
Mahonia Gardens Farm

(This information furnished by Jake Foster, No on Measure 103: Unnecessary, Misleading, Risky.)

Argument in Opposition

Vote No on Measure 103

Protect Families, Protect Communities, Protect our Constitution

As members of faith communities, we see the daily burden low-income families and individuals face. We are called to speak up for them. When we see injustice we are called to speak out against those who perpetrate unjust laws that hurt the most vulnerable.

*"Speak out for justice! Stand up for the poor and destitute!"
Proverbs 31:9*

And when we see powerful and well-funded interests using deceptive messages in the attempt to pass laws that benefit them and disadvantage those most in need, we are called to expose the lies.

*"And in their greed they will exploit you with false words."
2 Peter 2:3*

That is why your "No" vote on Measure 103 is so important.

Proponents are spending millions to convince voters that M103 will protect them from an increase in the cost of groceries. The truth is that, if implemented, M103 will add special loopholes in Oregon's Constitution that will hurt those most in need. It will make it even harder to fund schools, provide healthcare for our most fragile neighbors, and maintain basic support services for those most at risk in our community. We need laws that help those most in need, not a Constitutional Amendment that benefits the few.

This is why we oppose M103. It hurts those it pretends to help and benefits the special interests who, for their own gain, are exploiting the legitimate fears of those most economically distressed. We urge you to say no to those who only seek to enrich themselves under the guise of caring for the well-being of the citizens of Oregon.

Please vote No on Measure 103.

Oregon Coalition of Christian Voices

Church Women United of Lane County

Rabbi Debra Kolodny

Rev. Dr. Barbara Campbell

Rev. Vernon A. Groves, retired United Methodist Pastor

Rev. Aimee L. Bruno

Rev. Duane H. Fickeisen

Rev. Dr. Wheeler

Rev. Connie Yost

Rev. J.A. Mosbrucker

(This information furnished by John A Calhoun, Oregon Coalition of Christian Voices.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 103 Helps Special Interests, NOT Family Farmers. Vote NO on 103.

Antonio's Farm is a family farm based in Talent, Oregon where we grow berries, apples, pears, and corn.

Measure 103 is the most unnecessary constitutional amendment I've ever seen on Oregon's ballot.

Family-owned farms like ours can't afford to take unnecessary risks. One small mistake can cause permanent and irreversible damage. The same is true of Oregon's Constitution. Locking an unnecessary and risky amendment like 103 into our state's Constitution has permanent unintended consequences.

Our farm is always looking for ways to lower our costs so we can create jobs, produce more food and grow our business. **103 does NOTHING to help Oregon family farms like ours.** Instead, 103 enriches the same wealthy special interests that designed the measure and spent millions to put it on the ballot.

Measure 103 promoters are trying to mislead voters about their deceptive scheme. Despite their claims, 103 does NOT make our groceries more affordable. Oregon has never had a tax on groceries. I should know. We sell our goods to grocery stores. There's no good reason for voters to amend Oregon's Constitution with Measure 103.

We have a saying on our farm: If it isn't broke, don't fix it. It's unnecessary to waste time or resources solving problems that don't exist... that's how you risk breaking things. Amending Oregon's constitution with Measure 103 to fix a problem that doesn't exist isn't a risk we can't afford to take. We must defeat 103 to protect Oregon's Constitution.

For the sake of farm families across the state, learn more about Measure 103 at FactsAbout103.com.

Please join us by voting NO on 103.

(This information furnished by Dana T Freedenfeld, on behalf of Antonio's Farm.)

Argument in Opposition

We Oppose this "Grocery Tax" Constitutional Provision

Tax Fairness Oregon (TFO) is a non-partisan volunteer organization promoting tax fairness and equity. We analyze options and talk to the experts. Our goals are a fair and balanced tax system that provides sufficient revenues for basic services, including high quality education and health care.

Measure 103 is poorly written, unfair and misleading. No one is proposing a grocery tax. TFO would oppose any tax on retail groceries that would impact low-income families, but Measure 103 is absolutely the wrong way to protect families. The measure is deceptive because it exempts a wide range of businesses from taxation, not just grocery stores.

Measure 103 is much too broad. It creates a permanent "carve-out" for special interests and big corporations. It creates winners and losers, by putting those businesses that haul and distribute *non-food* items at a disadvantage.

And Measure 103 would also prohibit fee changes to maintain vital infrastructure, like seismic upgrades to roads and bridges and impact some fair, widely agreed-upon fees, such as the bottle fee and the weight-per-mile fees truckers pay when hauling foodstuffs.

Perhaps most importantly, tax policies need to be flexible to make sure businesses and families that need relief can get it. Since Measure 103 is a Constitutional amendment, such flexibility would be greatly impeded.

Don't let big, out-of-state corporations change Oregon's Constitution with badly-written tax policy.

JOIN TAX FAIRNESS OREGON IN VOTING NO on Measure 103!

(This information furnished by Jody Wisner, Executive Director, Tax Fairness Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

The American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network urges a NO vote on 103

Our mission at the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network is to prevent cancer, help patients with cancer to live longer and, ultimately, create a cancer-free Oregon. **Measure 103 is a misuse of our constitution and a threat to the health of Oregonians.**

Promoters of 103 say it's about "groceries." They're not telling the truth. We read the fine print, and here's what we found:

- 103 defines e-cigarettes as a "grocery" item
- **103 locks a tax loophole for Big Tobacco's addictive products into Oregon's Constitution**
- Special interests have spent millions trying to mislead voters about 103

The American Cancer Society urges voters to say NO to 103.

Not only is it unnecessary, it's completely misleading.

The single most effective way to prevent or reduce smoking, especially among kids, is to make tobacco products more expensive. But Measure 103 creates a permanent tax loophole for e-cigarettes.

Measure 103's one-size-fits-all approach ties the hands of local communities, permanently preventing voters statewide and in any city, town, or county from making decisions about how best to protect our children from harmful products like e-cigarettes.

That's why we strongly urge a NO vote on Measure 103.

(This information furnished by Christopher M Friend, the American Cancer Society Action Network.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 103 puts veteran services at risk.

My name is Josh Chambers and I'm a lifelong Oregon resident, father, and former soldier that proudly served 9 years in the Oregon Army National Guard.

This risky and unnecessary scheme would amend our constitution and put health care at risk for families and people like me.

In order to advocate for those I care for, I need to oppose Measure 103 as much as I can. During my time in the Army and afterwards I have witnessed soldiers struggle to make the transition back to civilian life. Many soldiers struggle with PTSD and other disabilities that can severely impact their quality of life.

Measure 103 is bad for Oregon veterans: It will severely and permanently damage our ability to fund programs that support our veterans.

I am asking you to join me in opposing this dangerous constitutional amendment. Special interest groups wrote this flawed constitutional amendment to cement big loopholes in our tax code. They don't seem to realize that vulnerable residents, veterans, will have to pay the price.

Veterans served our country proudly. Oregon should have the ability to provide the services that our veterans have earned. Please vote No on Measure 103.

Don't play politics with Oregon's veterans. Vote No on Measure 103

Joshua Chambers
Veteran, Army National Guard

(This information furnished by Jake Foster, on behalf of Joshua Chambers.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 103 is bad for Oregon's economy.

Measure 103 would worsen Oregon economy's biggest weakness – our underfunded schools (1) – while cementing bad policy into our state constitution.

The key to Oregon's future prosperity is investment in all Oregon students. . Nothing is more attractive to businesses than a skilled labor force. No economic strategy beats public investment in education and training, whether in pre-school, K-12, community college, trade schools or our state universities.

But the decades-long slide in corporate contributions to our state budget has meant a generation of cuts in our schools and public services, even as working and middle class families pay a higher and higher share of Oregon's costs. (2)

Locking in low taxes for the big grocers up and down the supply chain, while making it impossible to enact policies that would level the playing field for small, local businesses, is a mistake.

Measure 103 will lead to a more fragmented, distorted tax system — more complicated for businesses to navigate, more expensive for officials to administer, and more inequitable among businesses in different industries.

Oregonians shouldn't be bamboozled into giving up our ability to tax giant corporations, and losing our chance to restore our schools' capacity to create economic opportunity and a more inclusive economy.

Mary C. King
Professor of Economics Emerita
Portland State University

Citations:

(1) According to the Quality Education Commission, K-12 schools are underfunded by about \$1 billion a year. <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/reports-and-data/taskcomm/Pages/QEMReports.aspx>

(2) Oregon Center on Public Policy. <https://www.ocpp.org/2016/06/29/executive-summary-corporate-tax-decline/>

(This information furnished by Jake Foster, on behalf of Mary C. King.)

Argument in Opposition

A MESSAGE FROM THE CAMPAIGN FOR OREGON SENIORS AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

Protect Senior Services. Vote NO on Measure 103

We implore you to take a closer look at Measure 103 — a misleading and flawed constitutional amendment that is promoted by and for special interests. One important clue: the quotation marks around the word "groceries" in the ballot title tell you that there's more going on here than meets the eye.

The Campaign for Oregon Seniors and People with Disabilities closely examined Measure 103 and found that it would have a particularly negative impact on Oregon seniors and the services that they depend on.

Measure 103 doesn't just change the Constitution going forward, it also rewrites history because it is retroactive. It reaches into our healthcare system, eroding parts of the Medicaid funding package that voters just approved in January to fund health care and services for low-income families, children, and seniors.

Also of concern: the proponents of Measure 103 specifically left out necessities like diapers, medicine, and feminine hygiene products, calling them a "luxury."

For seniors living on a fixed income, it's important to know that Measure 103 does nothing to lower the cost of groceries. There is no tax on groceries. None have been passed by the legislature or put on the ballot. So ask yourself why special interests are spending millions of dollars to put Measure 103 on the ballot? It's not to help Oregonians.

These are among the reasons that we join organizations including AARP Oregon, Oregon Nurses Association, and Elders in Action to urge all Oregon voters to protect seniors, protect our Constitution and vote NO on Constitutional Amendment 103.

(This information furnished by Chris Madden, Campaign for Oregon's Seniors & People With Disabilities.)

Argument in Opposition

HOW FLAWED IS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 103? IT ACTUALLY **BANS LOWERING TAXES**

Please read the fine print on Measure 103. When you do, we are confident you will join us in voting NO on Measure 103.

This is a measure that only special interest lobbyists would love. It makes sense, since that is who wrote it. Its language is intentionally misleading and flawed. One of the things it would lock into Oregon's constitution: making it impossible to **LOWER** many taxes.

If you are surprised by that, so were we. But the big business interests that put this together wrote it to benefit themselves, not small Oregon businesses. Under this constitutional amendment, small business taxes for farmers and small grocers can never be lowered. It's right there, buried in the measure: you can look it up at <http://oregonvotes.org/irr/2018/037supct.pdf>.

It's tough enough to be a farmer these days. If Measure 103 passes, we can never help them with a simple tax break that could mean the difference between surviving and going under.

Please join small Oregon businesses and farmers from every part of the state in voting NO on 103!

Learn more: 103BadForBusiness.com

Anne Eldridge, Antonio's Farm, Talent

Anthony Effinger, Banter Partners, Portland

Carys Wilkins, Mahonia Gardens, Sisters

Christine Perala Gardiner PhD, Siskiyou Alpaca, Cave Junction

Eli Spevak, Orange Splot LLC, Portland

Elly Blue, Microcosm Publishing, Portland

Jam on Hawthorne, Portland

Jim Houser, Hawthorne Auto Clinic, Portland

Josh Hinerfeld, Cambium Strategy, Portland

K.A Hughes, Co-owner, Blue Scorcher Bakery/Cafe, Astoria

Lamia Attar, La Bouffe International Gourmet, Portland

Laurent Albouze, Prospect Bottle Shop, Portland

Mark Rainey, Cascade Record Pressing, Milwaukie

Mark Vanderzanden, Surround Architecture Inc, Portland

Nancy Montgomery, Columbia River Coffee Roaster, Astoria

Richard Goche, Sacred Sea Tuna, Coquille

Roger Fadness, Ohana Salsa Co, Bend

Sean Nikas, Busy Bees Real Estate, Salem

Terry Rusinow, Everett Street Guesthouse, Portland

Tom Beans, Dudley's Bookshop Cafe, Bend

(This information furnished by Dana T Freedenfeld, Vote No on 103: 103 is Bad for Business.)

Argument in Opposition

Join the American Federation of Teachers - Oregon. Vote NO on troubling, risky changes to Oregon's constitution.

Vote No on Measure 103

AFT-Oregon represents 13,000 Oregon workers in K-12, community college, and higher education in faculty and classified positions; as well as childcare workers, in both public and private sectors. AFT-Oregon advocates for quality education and health care for all Oregonians, and gives working educators a voice in the issues that matter most to our jobs, our families, and the students we serve.

The non-partisan AFT-Oregon Political and Legislative Affairs Committee spent several weeks studying this measure, listening to arguments and analysis, and assessing the potential impacts on our members.

As a result, **we are warning against Measure 103.**

Measure 103 is an unnecessary and risky change to Oregon's constitution that would permanently exempt some of the most profitable multinational corporations from paying a wide range of Oregon taxes or fees. **These carveouts could lead to a state budget crisis, resulting in even less funding for higher education and K-12 in Oregon.**

Supporters claim it's meant to keep groceries tax free, but that's simply misleading - there is no current tax on groceries and no one is proposing one. Measure 103 is a scheme devised by and for corporate special interests. The corporate lobbyists who are pushing the measure made so many drafting errors that the negative impacts of 103 would spill over to disrupt things like bottle deposit fees, fuel taxes for road repairs, climate change solutions, and even Medicaid funding that families rely on.

We should not change Oregon's constitution at the whim of special interests and big corporations who want to get their own special tax deal, especially when the changes are poorly written and would have loads of unintended consequences.

Everyday Oregonians need tax relief, but 103 only benefits big corporations.

Join educators and families across Oregon and vote NO on Measure 103!

Visit www.teachersagainst103.com to learn more.

(This information furnished by Marcus Swift, American Federation of Teachers - Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

Join advocates for women and families in Voting **No** on Measure 103

As advocates, we recognize that our economy is broken and the status quo simply doesn't work for many of us--women, people of color, LGBTQ communities, immigrants, people with disabilities and working families. We've made important gains recently, but we still have a long way to go.

We must look at policies that promote economic justice and stability for women, like paid family and medical leave, work-place flexibility, and quality, affordable childcare. At a time when one-third of Oregon's single working mothers and their children live below the poverty line, we need to focus on real problems and meaningful solutions.

That's why Measure 103 makes no sense. It doesn't address any real problems facing Oregon families. But it causes plenty of new ones.

Measure 103 is completely unnecessary - there is no tax on groceries and nobody is proposing one. Why would we amend the constitution for a problem that doesn't exist?

Measure 103 creates problems for women and families rather than solving them.

Because Measure 103 is retroactive, it would repeal parts of a provider tax voters approved in January to continue funding for Oregonians on Medicaid.

Childcare costs in Oregon are among the least affordable in the nation. The wealth gap for Oregon women is among the worst in the nation. And Measure 103 actually **fails to exempt the items that families rely on: diapers, medicine, and feminine hygiene products.**

We need to ensure that ballot measures are good for families and good for Oregon — policies that will move us forward. **But Measure 103 moves us backward.**

Protect our Constitution against this unnecessary measure that harms women and families.

League of Women Voter of Oregon

Forward Together

NARAL Pro-Choice Oregon

National Organization for Women - Oregon Chapter

Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon

Family Forward Oregon

(This information furnished by Lillian R Hoag, Family Forward.)

Argument in Opposition

Sierra Club and environmental groups statewide OPPOSE Measure 103

Our organizations represent over 100,000 Oregonians dedicated to protecting our state's air, water and land. One of our most important jobs is to alert Oregon voters when a measure on the ballot impacts Oregon's environment.

Environmental groups statewide oppose Measure 103 because it is a real, present and permanent danger to our state.

It's nearly impossible to reverse environmental damage. The same is true of damaging changes to Oregon's Constitution: The consequences of poorly written amendments like 103 are permanent. Special interests are spending millions trying to mislead voters about 103, but they can't hide the truth.

Measure 103 guarantees permanent and long-lasting damage to our environment and our Constitution.

Measure 103 protects corporate polluters, not Oregon families. Promoters of 103 claim their poorly written measure protects Oregonians. The truth is that it creates a permanent tax exemption for a long list of transactions, including many by out-of-state trucking companies. **Measure 103 grants corporate polluters a free ride to line their pocketbooks at the expense of our air and water quality.**

We all deserve to breathe clean air. That's one reason why our organizations advocate for stronger environmental protections. We all do our part to reduce pollution. The wealthy special interests promoting Measure 103 don't share our Oregon values. **Measure 103 is a deceptive scheme that would protect the profits of industries that pollute the air we breathe.**

We urge you to join environmental groups across the state by voting NO on 103 to stop this risky and flawed amendment from being permanently added to Oregon's constitution.

Protect Oregon's environment. Protect Oregon's Constitution. No on 103.

Sierra Club of Oregon

Oregon Wild

Oregon Environmental Council

OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon

Verde

Environment Oregon

See a full list of endorsers at www.NoOn103.org/coalition

(This information furnished by Rhett Lawrence, Conservation Director, Oregon Sierra Club.)

Argument in Opposition

Protect our Constitution:

Vote No on Measures 103, 104, and 106

*** We should only amend the constitution when there's an urgent need ***

*** Constitutional amendments lock in flaws — and cannot be fixed ***

*** Measures 103, 104, and 106 create special interest loopholes ***

*** No other state has constitutional amendments like these ***

Measures 103, 104 and 106 erode protections, creating flaws and loopholes for special interests that will be nearly impossible to change.

These amendments are costly, flawed and pointless, *but* we can protect Oregon by voting **No** on all three.

Measure 103 is a broad and sweeping constitutional change:

- It's retroactive, which means it rolls back existing services for Oregonians including healthcare for families. This cannot be changed.
- It's flawed and sloppy. Banning taxes on certain items in a nonsensical way that even its own authors do not understand the impact. If it passes, expect years of litigation.
- It only helps special interests, creating winners and losers in Oregon's tax laws based on who can afford a high-powered lobbyist.

Measure 104 adds a new layer of bureaucracy and gridlock:

- It protects special interest tax breaks, but makes it harder to help Oregon families.
- It's pointless for us, but it helps a narrow few: the Constitution already requires a supermajority threshold for new taxes on Oregonians.
- Designed to protect oil and gas interests. This measure protects specific loopholes for specific industries.

Measure 106 puts cuts to healthcare into Oregon's constitution:

- It cuts access to healthcare for low-income Oregonians and public employees
- Sets a dangerous precedent of constitutionally cherry picking which medical procedures will and won't be covered. That has never been done before in Oregon's constitution.
- Takes away needed healthcare coverage from teachers, firefighters, and tens of thousands more.

Poorly drafted Constitutional Amendments like Measures 103, 104 and 106 are nearly impossible to change. Their flaws will be locked into our constitution.

Vote No on Measures 103, 104 and 106

(This information furnished by Elisabeth Swarttouw, No on Measure 103: Because the Constitution should only be amended when absolutely necessary.)

Argument in Opposition

The Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 503 and Local 49 say NO on 103

SEIU represents more than 70,000 healthcare, property services, homecare and public services workers in Oregon. We are members of every community in Oregon, from Portland to Malheur County, and we care about the direction of our state.

Measure 103 is an unnecessary, flawed change to Oregon's constitution, written by and for special interests, NOT working families. We urge a NO on Measure 103.

Oregon's constitution should only be changed for major or urgent problems. Measure 103 would put big tax loopholes into the constitution to benefit specific corporations. That's far from a good reason to amend the constitution.

The measure is unnecessary. Oregon doesn't have a sales tax on groceries and no one is proposing one. We shouldn't be wasting time and money amending the Constitution to prohibit a tax that doesn't exist.

The lobbyists behind 103 made it confusing. They defined "groceries" in a misleading way. Under the measure, e-cigarettes and restaurant meals are defined as groceries, but items families buy everyday are not, such as diapers and toilet paper. It's clear that this measure isn't about protecting consumers, it's about padding the profits of out-of-state corporate retailers that do business here. That's why they are spending millions to pass it.

103 is also retroactive, which means it could undo the Medicaid funding voters overwhelmingly passed in January, putting hundreds of thousands of people at risk of losing their healthcare.

Because Measure 103 amends the constitution these mistakes cannot be undone.

Please vote No on Measure 103.

(This information furnished by Elvyss Argueta, SEIU Local 503 OPEU.)

Argument in Opposition

CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND RECOMMENDS A "NO" VOTE ON MEASURE 103

A volunteer research committee made up of City Club members investigated Measure 103 and found that it has the potential to create significant administrative and legal problems in the state by inserting a tax loophole directly into the Oregon constitution.

City Club members reviewed the research and voted to approve it and to recommend that Oregon voters vote "no" in November.

Why vote NO?

- The language is unclear. Restaurants, food distributors, and anyone else selling consumable items that are not alcohol, marijuana, or tobacco could enjoy a tax exemption—even hospitals and trucking companies.
- The costs of taxing and regulating businesses will increase because it is not clear who or what is covered by this measure.
- By taking this preemptive action, grocers may avoid future taxes that other businesses will have to pay.
- There's no effort to target apples or bread for new taxes, so why are we amending the state constitution?

The state constitution does not need to be changed to protect groceries or grocers. Vote NO on Measure 103.

About City Club of Portland

Since 1916, City Club of Portland has conducted nonpartisan research for the benefit of all Oregonians. Today, we're building on that legacy by bringing together a diverse community of thinkers and doers to spark change across our region.

For more information about City Club of Portland or to read our ballot measure reports, visit www.pdxcityclub.org, email info@pdxcityclub.org, or call 503-228-7231.

(This information furnished by City Club of Portland, Julia Meier, Executive Director.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon AFSCME Opposes Measure 103, a risky threat to our constitution

Oregon AFSCME, which represents over 28,000 workers in Oregon, strongly opposes Measure 103.

Measure 103 is poorly drafted, riddled with unintended consequences, and is a risky scheme to deliver a windfall for some of the richest companies in America. Measure 103 would permanently change our state constitution, making it almost impossible to come back and fix the damage. In addition, Measure 103 is unnecessary because there is no tax on groceries in Oregon.

Measure 103 is a poorly written measure that seeks to exempt certain industries from any future taxes. It ties the hands of future Oregonians to make sound financial decisions so that a small group of special interests will benefit. Worse, it locks in tax rates for small businesses so that they can NEVER be lowered.

Proponents say Measure 103 is about groceries but it is so broadly written that it exempts restaurant meals and gas taxes when food is transported around the state. What it doesn't protect from taxes? Family necessities such as diapers, toilet paper, and medicine.

Measure 103 is deeply misleading — the proponents pretend that their measure helps Oregon families, when the truth is that it only benefits wealthy corporations. The proponents of this measure are trying to sell Oregonians a rotten deal. Don't buy it.

Join Oregon workers in voting No on Measure 103

(This information furnished by Joseph E Baessler, Oregon AFSCME.)

Argument in Opposition

Vote No on Measure 103

Measure 103 is Retroactive

**Measure 103 Rolls Back
Voter-Approved Healthcare Protections**

Measure 103 Ends Funding for Road Projects

*No One Knows the Full Impact of Measure 103's Risky
Retroactive Scheme*

Adding amendments to our Constitution is always risky, but it becomes even more dangerous when the constitutional amendment goes back in time to roll back laws voters have already passed.

Measure 103 sends Oregon back in time, and in doing so threatens healthcare and transportation funding. The lobbyists that wrote Measure 103 cannot say just how many voter-approved measures are undone by Measure 103.

But if Measure 103 passes, this is what Oregonians can expect:

- Years of litigation by special interests trying to get REPAID for taxes they once paid
- Cuts to healthcare funding and the loss of healthcare for Oregon families
- The partial repeal of local measures passed by voters to fund schools, parks, roads, and more
- Millions of dollars in new bureaucracy created to try and enforce a law that has so many flaws, loopholes, and rules that no one can agree what Measure 103 does and doesn't do

Our election isn't some science fiction movie: We shouldn't be able to go back in time to hurt Oregon families.

This is another good example of why lobbyists and special interests should not rewrite Oregon's constitution.

Measure 103: a risky retroactive constitutional amendment that Oregon families can't afford.

Vote No on Measure 103

(This information furnished by Thomas K Adamson, Vote No on Measure 103.)

Argument in Opposition

I'm Susan Justice.

I'm a **Republican**.

I'm Lou Egress.

I'm a **Democrat**.

We don't agree on most issues but **we agree that the constitution should not be changed** unless it is being done to make an urgent, important change.

Measure 103 does **not** meet that threshold. It is risky, pointless and has no place in our constitution. It would add broad, permanent and untested loopholes for specific businesses to our state constitution.

Worse, it is **completely unnecessary** since there is NO tax on groceries right now and no one is proposing any. The lobbyists who wrote the bill also included an unusual provision that made 103 retroactive so it repeals part of the Medicaid funding voters approved to protect families from losing healthcare.

The measure defines groceries in a misleading way, including items like e-cigarettes and restaurant meals but failing to include items families rely on like medicine, diapers and toilet paper. Measure 103 creates permanent tax loopholes for special interests.

Plus, Measure 103's writers made a number of mistakes that can't be undone. If the measure passes, small business taxes for farmers and small grocers could never be lowered.

For these and other reasons, even a Republican and Democrat like us can agree: Measure 103 is pointless, misleading and wrong.

Join us and vote NO on 103.

(This information furnished by Thomas K Adamson, No on Measure 103: Unnecessary, Misleading, Risky.)

Argument in Opposition

OREGON NURSES ASSOCIATION
REJECTS MEASURE 103

Everyday, Oregon nurses are on the frontlines caring for Oregonians all across the state. It is our job to provide quality care to our patients and promote healthy communities for all.

That's why we're voting No on Measure 103.

Measure 103 is an **unprecedented and permanent** change to Oregon's constitution that would put health care for Oregon families at risk.

The constitutional amendment is **retroactive** and would result in a repeal of part of the voter-approved provider assessments that fund Medicaid for low-income families, children and seniors.

Measure 103 would exempt some corporations from paying to support Oregon families and communities.

As nurses, we advocate and care for the whole patient - we know a person's ability to access healthy food, safe neighborhoods and housing, transportation, and education is essential to their health and well-being.

Measure 103 would harm our ability to provide quality and affordable health care, housing, transportation and education to Oregonians.

Measure 103 is **completely unnecessary**. It doesn't fix any problems.

In fact, it **makes things worse**. It would amend the constitution to permanently exempt e-cigarettes from any future taxes to support necessary health care programs. According to the Center of Disease Control, in 2016, more than 2 million U.S. middle and high school students used e-cigarettes in the past 30 days. That number continues to grow and we spend nearly \$1.54 billion a year in smoking-caused health care costs. (2)

Oregon's children will suffer under Measure 103. They won't have protections from the proliferation of e-cigarettes and they'll have less access to necessary health care and education.

Measure 103 is bad for our health. And it's bad for Oregon.

Join Oregon Nurses in saying No to Measure 103.

1 Oregon Healthy Teens Survey, 2017.
2 Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, Broken Promises to Our Children: a State-by-State Look at the 1998 State Tobacco Settlement 19 Years Later FY2018, 2017.

(This information furnished by Christopher Rayborn, Oregon Nurses Association.)

Argument in Opposition

Dozens of community organizations have come together to oppose Measure 103.

Join the following organizations and many more in rejecting unnecessary, risky amendments to Oregon's constitution.

Stand up for Oregon values. Don't let special interests bend and twist our constitution to benefit only themselves.

Below is a partial list of organizations who urge a NO on Measure 103. To see the full list, please visit NoOn103.org/coalition.

Oregon Environmental Council, Oregon Nurses Association, American Heart Association, AARP Oregon, Campaign for Oregon's Seniors & People with Disabilities, League of Women Voters of Oregon, Verde, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, Farmers Market Fund, Oregon PTA, Nike Inc., National Organization for Women – Oregon Chapter, APANO, Urban League of Portland, OSPIRG, Causa, Oregon Coalition for Christian Voices, Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste (PCUN), Unite Oregon, Bus Project, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Alliance (TANF), Oregon Center for Public Policy, Oregon School Employees Association, Children First, Community Alliance of Tenants, American Federation of Teachers - Oregon, Oregon Wild, Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon, NARAL Pro-Choice Oregon, NAACP - Portland Chapter, Health Care Coalition of Southern Oregon, Health Care for All Oregon, Portland Tenants United, Jobs with Justice, AFSCME State Council 75, Oregon Education Association, SEIU Local 503, Oregon AFL-CIO, Right 2 Survive, Basic Rights Oregon, Family Forward Oregon, Rural Organizing Project, Climate Solutions, Oregon Public Health Institute, Familias en Acción, Coalition of Communities of Color, Hacienda CDC, American Association of University Professors, Oregon Fair Trade Campaign, Democratic Socialists of America Portland, Welcome Home Coalition, Partners for a Hunger-Free Oregon, Elders in Action, Sierra Club Oregon, Forward Together, Tax Fairness Oregon, Upstream Public Health, Oregon Pediatric Society, Oregon Public Health Association, The Vocal Seniority, Environment Oregon, Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility, Fair Shot, Friends of Family Farmers, American Association of University Women of Oregon, Association of Oregon Faculties

(This information furnished by Elisabeth Swarttouw, Vote No on Measure 103.)

Argument in Opposition

WE ARE FRIENDS OF FAMILY FARMERS AND WE ARE SAYING NO TO MISLEADING, UNNECESSARY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 103

At Friends of Family Farmers, we are committed to advancing policies that support family farmers, and access to affordable, healthy and locally grown food for all Oregonians. We have closely studied the potential impact of Measure 103 and we are encouraging our members and all Oregonians to vote NO this November.

Protecting family farms and keeping healthy, local food affordable is something we believe in strongly. But Measure 103 is totally misleading. Because this measure amends Oregon's constitution for the benefit of out-of-state corporations – while claiming to support local farmers – we cannot in good conscience support it. The special interests who wrote Measure 103 say it will help farmers, but what it really does is protect big business profits while preventing the state from providing tax relief for small and mid-sized family farmers who need it.

The Oregon Attorney General authored a ballot title that says if passed, Measure 103 would prevent any amendments to certain taxes. This means that ***certain taxes and fees farmers pay can't be lowered or eliminated if Measure 103 passes - they will be locked into our state's constitution!*** Under Measure 103, family farmers and ranchers will NEVER be able to get certain kinds of tax relief.

Family farmers and rural residents know what policies make sense for our local communities. Not only does Measure 103 prevent us from getting tax relief, it also strips us of our ability to vote on many local policies. We can't let out-of-state special interests interfere in local democracy, taking away our ability to pass local measures that are right for our communities.

Measure 103 is built on **misleading claims** intended to scare voters into supporting it.

Support Family Farmers. Vote No on Measure 103.

Learn more at FarmersAgainst103.com

(This information furnished by Ivan Maluski, Friends of Family Farmers.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon PTA Says NO to Measures 103 & 104

Oregon PTA's mission is to engage and empower families and communities to advocate for public policy that helps every child realize their potential. As an organization, one of our core charges is to advocate for adequately funding schools with stable revenue streams.

As active parents and members of Oregon PTA, we know that Measure 103 and Measure 104 do nothing to help fund schools, and it will actually make it **even more difficult** to give our kids the resources they need to succeed. By giving away new tax loopholes to special interests, making it harder to eliminate existing tax loopholes, and opening the door to even more gridlock in Salem, Measures 103 and 104 will seriously hinder our ability to fully fund K-12 education in Oregon.

These constitutional amendments are risky and will have far-reaching consequences. It is our duty as voters (and as parents) to be thoughtful and deliberate — and **only amend it when absolutely necessary.** Measures 103 and 104 are **not** solving urgent problems. They aren't written for families like ours, they were only written to benefit the few.

Vote NO to send a strong message to special interests that we don't want to play games with our constitution. We want action to fund education and the programs that students in our state need to succeed. Too many students arrive at school each morning hungry and don't have a stable place to go home to after class. As members of our school communities, we need to look after each other - not special interests' bottom lines.

Join parents from around Oregon and the Oregon PTA in opposing 103 & 104.

Sharon Meigh-Chang, Portland	Diane McCalmont, Florence	Kristi Dille, Clackamas
Collin Robinson, Bend	Jeff Hanes, Salem	Scott Overton, Portland
Roger Kirchner, Portland	Lisa Kersel, Portland	Kevin McHargue, Portland
Erica Hailstone, Portland	L. Otto Schell, Portland	

(This information furnished by Lawrence O Schell, Oregon PTA.)

Argument in Opposition

The League of Women Voters of Oregon Opposes Measure 103

It's the wrong policy for Oregon.

The LWV of Oregon evaluates public policy and ballot measures from every angle in order to take informed and rational positions. We've looked closely at Measure 103 and concluded that it is the wrong policy for Oregon and we are urging a No vote.

TAX POLICY SHOULD NOT BE MADE THROUGH CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

Oregon families, businesses and consumers need flexible tax policy. That's why enshrining tax policy in the constitution is foolhardy. Often, ballot measures are written to have a catchy 30-second slogan. But tax policy, and especially constitutional amendments, require a more thoughtful and well-vetted approach. Once something is in the constitution, it is difficult to change.

No other state has a constitutional amendment like this, and for good reason. Oregon's constitution is not a testing ground for risky tax experiments.

OREGONIANS DESERVE TAX-FREE FOOD, BUT MEASURE 103 IS THE WRONG WAY TO DO THAT.

Measure 103 isn't about groceries: It's so broadly written, that it exempts or impacts a wide range of corporate taxes and transactions, including those for fast food meals, e-cigarettes, transportation and health care. Measure 103 purports to keep groceries free of taxes. It would do much more than that. The state could not collect fuel taxes from grocers' truck fleets to pay for the trucks' wear and tear on our highways. It would also prohibit the state or any local government from imposing a tax on sugary drinks. The LWV of Oregon supports an equitable and broad-based tax system. Exempting one section of the retail industry is most definitely inequitable. Carving out an exemption for an entire section of taxpayers, narrows, rather than broadens, the tax base.

Because it tries to put tax policy in the state constitution, violates tax equity, and does not spread tax burdens broadly, the LWV of Oregon definitively opposes the confusing tax ballot measure 103.

(This information furnished by Norman Turrill, President, League of Women Voters of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregonians oppose sales taxes. This is a known fact in Oregon politics.

"That raises the question: why amend the constitution to stop a form of taxation that's been political poison for most of a century?" *The Skanner*

This prohibition would be the first of its kind nationally.

Measure 103 would freeze the state's corporate minimum tax only for grocery stores and restaurants. It would put super-markets and restaurants in a separate category from all other businesses regarding the corporate minimum tax.

It would include prohibiting not only local taxes on sugary drinks that are now being taxed in Seattle, Oakland and many other cities in efforts to address diabetes and obesity, but also new local restaurant taxes vital to Oregon communities -- like Ashland's restaurant tax that pays for sewer infrastructure and park acquisition, and that in Yachats which funds the city's wastewater treatment. These local taxes were approved by voters in their community.

We should allow the voters of each Oregon city and county to make decisions related to local taxes to fund local priorities.

The Mayors and local officials on the League of Oregon Cities Board unanimously oppose this measure's infringement on local authority and the ability of citizens to make choices for their community

Timm Slater, LOC President

More cause for alarm:

"Given the proposal's definition of "groceries" and "sale or distribution," state officials have said the proposal would have widespread effects — roping in operations throughout the grocery supply chain, from farm to table."
Oregon Public Broadcasting

"Mary King, professor of economics emerita at Portland State University, said the ballot measure is "a massive, unprecedented carve-out for some of the biggest retailers in the world that will apply to far more than just the food they sell."
Pamplin Media

Please vote No, to maintain local control and commercial equality in Oregon.

(This information furnished by Amanda L Fritz.)

Argument in Opposition

Elected Leaders Across Oregon Come Together to Protect Our Constitution

As elected leaders chosen by our neighbors to create policies that make sense for our local communities, we oppose Constitutional Amendment 103. We must be careful about amending our Constitution. If an amendment has harmful flaws, we won't be able to fix them. We should only amend the constitution when it's urgent and necessary, and **Constitutional Amendment 103 doesn't pass the test.**

This risky and unnecessary Constitutional Amendment would:

- Prevent local voters from making their own decisions about community funding and public health issues
- Add unprecedented new tax loopholes to Oregon's Constitution
- Jeopardize Medicaid healthcare funding
- Put funding for roads and infrastructure improvements at risk
- Prevent local and statewide laws that would lower taxes for many small businesses

These far-reaching effects would hit all cities and all counties in every corner of our state. It's simply too dangerous to put this flawed and risky experiment into Oregon's constitution.

Join us in voting NO on Measure 103.

State Senator Lee Beyer
 State Senator Elizabeth Steiner Hayward
 State Senator Rob Wagner
 State Representative Julie Fahey
 State Representative Rob Nosse
 Multnomah County Chair Deborah Kafoury
 Washington County Commissioner Greg Malinowski
 Multnomah County Commissioner Sharon Meieran
 Washington County Commissioner Dick Schouten
 Lane County Commissioner Pete Sorenson
 Multnomah County Commissioner Jessica Vega Pederson
 Milwaukie Mayor Mark Gamba
 Wilsonville Mayor Tim Knapp
 Astoria Mayor Arline LaMear
 Eugene Mayor Lucy Vinis
 Bend City Councilor Barb Campbell
 Gearhart City Councilor Paulina Cockrum
 Sherwood City Councilor Sean Garland
 Ashland City Councilor Stephen Jensen
 Lake Oswego City Councilor Theresa Kohlhoff
 Bay City City Councilor David McCall
 Ashland City Councilor Rich Rosenthal
 West Linn City Councilor Richard Sakelik
 Happy Valley City Councilor Brett Sherman
 Beaverton City Councilor Marc San Soucie
 Medford City Councilor Kevin Stine
 Lane Community College Board Vice-Chair Matt Keating
 and many more...

(This information furnished by Theresa M Kohlhoff, Lake Oswego City Councilor.)

Argument in Opposition

LEADERS IN HEALTHCARE URGE:

NO ON MEASURE 103

Measure 103 changes Oregon's Constitution, putting the health of our communities at risk. Oregonians should vote No on November 6th to protect our Constitution and stand up for accessible, quality healthcare and strong public health programs.

As health advocates, we believe every Oregon family should have access to healthy affordable food and a doctor or nurse when they are sick. Measure 103 doesn't do anything to keep healthy food affordable but it does jeopardize funding for Medicaid.

RETROACTIVE:

The special interest lobbyists who are pushing Measure 103 included an unusual provision making the measure retroactive to September 2017. Therefore it reverses any new funding that has been in effect since September 2017. Unfortunately for Oregon families, that means a repeal of parts of the law that fund Medicaid for low-income families, seniors and kids.

E-CIGARETTES:

Measure 103 helps Big Tobacco and other manufacturers of e-cigarettes. If Measure 103 passes, cities and counties in Oregon could never pass a tax or fee intended to curb consumption of nicotine e-cigarette products and fund healthcare with the revenues. Measure 103 is a great deal for Big Tobacco as more and more smokers switch to e-cigarettes.

PUBLIC HEALTH:

Many cities and counties in Oregon lead the way in setting policies to improve health outcomes in their communities. Measure 103 interferes in local democracy and prevents voters from passing certain evidence-based public health policies. We oppose special interests taking away power from

local voters to make decisions about what is best for their own communities.

We can't let special interests pushing their own agenda jeopardize the health of Oregonians.

Join us. Vote NO on 103 this November.

American Heart Association
 American Diabetes Association
 American Cancer Society - Cancer Action Network
 Cascade AIDS
 Health Care for All Oregon
 Health Care Coalition of Southern Oregon
 Oregon Public Health Institute
 Oregon Public Health Association
 Oregon Pediatric Society
 Upstream Public Health

(This information furnished by Christina S Bodamer, American Heart Association.)

Argument in Opposition

We must be very careful when choosing to amend Oregon's constitution.

That's why AARP strongly opposes Measure 103 and Measure 104.

AARP urges a NO vote on Measures 103 & 104

These ballot measures are completely unnecessary. These measures are a waste of time and money.

- Oregon doesn't have a tax on groceries and no one is proposing one.
- And we already have a supermajority requirement for raising revenue.

This is a risky experiment for Oregon's constitution. Changing the constitution should only be done when there's a real emergency or crisis.

- Measure 103 is unprecedented and untested, so we shouldn't risk our constitution for it. And
- Measure 104 will lead to more legislative gridlock, putting funding for healthcare and other senior services at risk

These measures will create harmful unintended consequences

- Measure 103 would create special-interest carve outs for industry, dramatically reduce state revenues and harm health care funding.
- Measure 104 would make it very difficult to end wasteful tax breaks and spending.

Please join AARP Oregon and dozens of other trusted groups

Vote NO on Measure 103 and Measure 104

(This information furnished by Jonathan D Bartholomew, AARP Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

TRUSTED ORGANIZATIONS AGREE:

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 103

It's just not worth the risk and the waste

Measure 103 would add a risky, useless, and untested new experiment to Oregon's constitution. As trusted organizations from **every part of the political spectrum**, we urge Oregonians to **oppose** Measure 103 and protect our Constitution from dangerous, misleading changes.

There is no tax on groceries, no one is proposing one, and this amendment is so poorly written and so misleading that it actually fails to protect essentials that families rely on, like diapers, soap, and medicine.

The worst part? When things go wrong with Measure 103, it'll be nearly impossible to fix it because all the flaws will be locked into our constitution. **Vote NO on Measure 103.**

A partial list of organizations who urge a NO on Measure 103. To see the full list, please visit NoOn103.org/coalition.

- AARP Oregon
- League of Women Voters Oregon
- Oregon Nurses Association
- American Heart Association
- American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network
- Farmers Market Fund
- National Organization for Women – Oregon Chapter
- SEIU Local 503
- Oregon AFL-CIO
- Basic Rights Oregon
- Nike Inc.
- NAACP - Portland Chapter
- Familias en Acción
- NARAL Pro-Choice Oregon
- Coalition of Communities of Color
- Hacienda CDC
- Children First
- Sierra Club Oregon
- American Federation of Teachers - Oregon
- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Alliance (TANF)
- Oregon Public Health Association
- Oregon Environmental Council
- Partners for a Hunger-Free Oregon
- Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon
- Friends of Family Farmers
- Health Care Coalition of Southern Oregon
- APANO
- OSPIRG
- AFSCME State Council 75
- Health Care for All Oregon
- Urban League PDX
- Oregon Education Association
- Family Forward Oregon
- Rural Organizing Project
- Causa
- Campaign for Oregon's Seniors & People with Disabilities
- Verde
- Forward Together
- Welcome Home Coalition
- Bus Project
- Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste (PCUN)
- Unite Oregon
- Oregon PTA
- Oregon School Employees Association
- Oregon Coalition of Christian Voices
- Oregon Public Health Institute
- Portland Jobs with Justice
- Oregon Fair Trade Campaign
- Democratic Socialists of America Portland

(This information furnished by Elisabeth Swarttouw, No on Measure 103: Unnecessary, Misleading, Risky.)

Argument in Opposition

We are members of The Common Good Fund, a fund with a mission to advance the common good in Oregon.

We generally oppose creating or amending state tax policy through ballot measures – especially those that alter the Oregon Constitution.

Together we represent many home-grown businesses, and we love Oregon. **Oregonians should guard against major policy mistakes that could undermine the building blocks of what makes Oregon special.**

For those reasons and others, we urge voters to say 'No' to Measures 103 & 104.

--

"The two measures would become constitutional amendments, meaning every word of both would be inserted into the Oregon Constitution. Errors in the drafting of ballot measures are expensive to correct. Oregon's tax code should be modernized to treat individuals and businesses fairly, deliver stability during economic downturns and fund essential public services, including our public schools, parks, libraries and public safety. Constitutional Amendments 103 and 104 are not the way to do it."

Julia Brim-Edwards, Nike, Inc.

--

"As a growing, new, Oregon-based company, we urge voters to reject Measures 103 and 104. Oregon must remain a place which fosters a vibrant tech industry with well-paying jobs.

That means greater investments in public schools and a thoughtful, stable tax policy for businesses like ours. Flawed, poorly written measures like 103 and 104 are not the answer. "

Mat Ellis, Cloudbility

--

"As a business owner I am deeply troubled by Measures 103 and 104. Even small changes in law impact our ability to stay afloat. These measures would stifle Oregon's economy rather than grow it.

In our business, we know how important it is for Oregonians to have access to stable, affordable housing. Measures 103 and 104 will make the housing crisis in Oregon worse by making it harder to fund housing adequately."

John Russell, Russell Development Company

--

Join us & other Oregon businesses in voting NO on 103 & 104.

Full list of businesses and others at www.NoOn103.org/coalition

(This information furnished by John W Russell, Common Good Fund.)

Argument in Opposition

Who Benefits from Measure 103?

SPOILER ALERT: It's not everyday Oregonians.

Just look who is spending millions to pass it...

When a measure gets placed on the ballot, the first thing we should always ask is: who's behind this?

Measure 103 is worth digging into – when you look at who's promoting it, you'll see that some of the largest corporations in the world are funding Measure 103 for one reason: It locks a tax loophole designed by and for them into Oregon's Constitution.

IT'S NOT FOR US – IT'S FOR THEM.

By August 20th, these special interests had already spent millions: (1)

Kroger has spent \$813,300.

Albertsons/Safeway has spent \$1,013,300.

Costco has spent \$568,301.

Nationally, retail corporations have spent tens of millions passing special tax exemptions just like Measure 103.

They believe that they can lock in a tax-free future for just their industry forever and add to their billions in profits.

Just look what they pay their CEOs:

***Kroger paid their CEO \$11.5 million in 2017.(2)*

***Costco paid their CEO \$6.6 million.(3)*

***Walmart paid their CEO \$22.8 million.(4)*

But these companies don't need a break — we do. Food prices keep going up, and we're paying more even though the farmers that grow the food make less and less.

If Measure 103 passes, these companies will make more and their CEOs will likely get a pay raise, but our bills will only keep getting more expensive.

Measure 103 creates a special loophole in the Constitution for out-of-state corporations, their CEOs, and their lobbyists — while it hurts Oregonians.

Vote to protect Oregonians by voting No on Measure 103

Citations:

(1) Oregon Secretary of State, ORESTAR, <https://secure.sos.state.or.us/orestar/gotoPublicTransactionSearch.do>

(2) Kroger 2018 Proxy statement, <http://ir.kroger.com/>

(3) Costco 2017 Proxy statement, <http://phx.corporate-ir.net/phoenix.zhtml?c=83830&p=irol-irhome>

(4) Walmart 2018 Proxy statement, <http://stock.walmart.com/investors/>

(This information furnished by Thomas K Adamson, Vote No on 103: Say no to loopholes by and for special interests.)

Argument in Opposition

We Urge Caution When Amending Oregon's Constitution.

As professors and practitioners of constitutional law and/or economics, we study Oregon's Constitution and how it protects the rights of Oregonians. **Constitutional amendments lock in real, lasting consequences that cannot be easily undone.**

The history of Oregon's Constitution shows many examples of flawed amendments written by special interests. Those flaws are incredibly difficult to fix once enacted; it can take decades to fix even the smallest problem.

Measures 103 and 104 were written by lobbyists - not accountants, economists, or constitutional experts - and the mistakes in the text are daunting. It's unclear what these measures would actually do. Experts disagree about their impact and scope. Lawsuits will determine the final effect, but once the Supreme Court finally sorts out the vague text, changes cannot be made without another statewide ballot measure.

The flaws in these measures are unacceptable, especially because these measures do not actually address urgent problems. Measure 103 bans a tax that doesn't exist. Measure 104 takes Oregon's supermajority requirement that protects taxpayers and expands it to protect special interests. This does not meet the threshold for an urgent need.

Simply put, slick campaign slogans do not translate into sound public policy.

Measures 103 and 104 would create new loopholes and make it monumentally more difficult to eliminate existing ones. By carving new exemptions in stone, well-funded special interests with the resources to take advantage of new loopholes will do so — while other taxpayers foot the bill. This is not fair, and will lead to years of problems down the road.

We hope Oregonians will consider their vote carefully before putting messy and risky new amendments into our Constitution.

Please join us in voting NO on Measures 103 & 104.

Margaret Hallock, Professor Emeritus, University of Oregon

Paul Diller, Professor of Law, Willamette University

Margaret Olney, JD

Aruna Masih, JD

Institutional affiliations listed for identification purposes only and do not represent endorsements by the institutions.

(This information furnished by Jake Foster, Vote No on 103: Protect Oregon's Constitution.)

Argument in Opposition

DON'T LET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 103 TAKE LOCAL CONTROL FROM RURAL OREGON

In Oregon, one size doesn't fit all. As elected leaders from communities around Oregon, we can tell you that our needs and priorities are can be very different from priorities Portland and Salem.

That is why the principle of local control is so important, and why we ask you to vote NO on Constitutional Amendment 103.

Many have talked about the fact that 103 is both poorly and misleadingly written and would lock that flawed language into Oregon's constitution. But it also takes away our citizens' ability to make decisions about how best to deliver and pay for the local services we rely on. The stakes are so much higher in rural Oregon, which face challenges that politicians in the Willamette Valley don't always understand.

We would never tell other parts of the state how best to govern themselves. We just ask for the same consideration.

One thing we all have in common as Oregonians is our constitution. As the basic document that guarantees our rights and freedom, what it doesn't control is sometimes more important than what it does. That's why we should always be careful about changing it, and we certainly shouldn't change it in a way that permanently takes away our communities' ability to make the decisions that are right for us. That's what Constitutional Amendment 103 would do, and why we urge you to vote No.

Gearhart City Councilor Paulina Cockrum

Ashland City Councilor Stephen Jensen

Bay City City Councilor David McCall

Ashland City Councilor Rich Rosenthal

Medford City Councilor Kevin Stine

(This information furnished by Jake Foster, Vote No on 103: Protect Oregon's Constitution.)

Argument in Opposition

**Put Oregon kids before special interests:
Vote NO on Measure 103.**

At Children First for Oregon, our mission is to build a state where all children thrive. That's why we're opposed to Measure 103.

**It's a risky and misleading measure that
could hurt Oregon kids and families.**

If you want to stand up for Oregon kids, join us in voting No on Measure 103. Here's why:

1. Measure 103 puts special interests before Oregon's children — By carving a permanent loophole into Oregon's constitution for specific industries, Measure 103 would prioritize these companies above any future needs of Oregon's children, making it harder to support families and allow all children to thrive. Measure 103 could result in rolling back funding for everything from healthcare and education to road improvements. Oregon needs to prioritize children's interests over carveouts for special interests.

2. Measure 103 is misleading — It defines "groceries" in a way that does not help Oregon families. Measure 103 exempts vaping products and private catering from taxes, but it doesn't exempt items families rely on every single day such as diapers, medicine, and toilet paper.

3. Measure 103 is untested — Oregon would be the first state in the country to have such a wide-ranging special interest loophole. This confusing new law would be locked into our state's constitution. We shouldn't subject Oregon kids to a risky experiment that would be locked into our Constitution for generations to come.

For these reasons, we urge you to join us in voting NO on Measure 103 this November. Oregon's children deserve better.

(This information furnished by Chris Coughlin, Children First for Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon educators say no on Measures 103 and 104

There are two constitutional amendments on the ballot in November that are risky, unnecessary, and will hurt Oregon kids.

Oregon's students cannot afford Measures 103 and 104. These two Constitutional Amendments were put forth by special interests to protect Oregon's low corporate tax rate. Here's what Measures 103 and 104 would do:

- Measures 103 and 104 block new funding for K-12 education and protect massive tax breaks for corporations and the wealthy.
- Measures 103 and 104 undermine efforts to expand technical and vocational training.
- Measures 103 and 104 limit our state's ability to improve the quality of our schools.
- Measures 103 and 104 keep Oregon's classroom sizes at some of the highest in the nation.

Our neighborhood and community schools would suffer under Measures 103 and 104.

Measures 103 and 104 are backed by special interests to protect special interests and corporate profits.

In history classes, we teach that constitutional amendments are supposed to reflect Oregon's fundamental values. It is no place for a first-in-the-nation, untested experiment. Oregonians value public education, not special immunity for corporate interests.

**Protect school funding
Protect our kids, not special interests
Vote NO on Measures 103 and 104**

(This information furnished by Trent A Lutz, Oregon Education Association.)

Argument in Opposition

In my over 40 years on the bench, I relied on Oregon's Constitution to protect Oregonians' rights. We should only change the constitution when there's an urgent and important reason to do so.

That's why I oppose Measure 103. This Constitutional Amendment locks significant changes into our constitution for loosely defined policies that do not help most Oregonians.

As a voter, I believe you need to know the facts.

Measure 103 is a sweeping constitutional change:

- It permanently rewrites the tax code by placing very specific regulations into the Oregon Constitution.
- It is loosely written, and they predict it would cut existing services on everything from healthcare for families to transportation dollars to improve roads.
- It would be the first law of its kind in the nation, making Oregon a testing ground for this risky constitutional experiment.

Measure 103 is flawed and troubling:

- It bans taxes on certain items in such a haphazard way that we expect years of litigation by certain businesses and industries looking to avoid taxes.
- It permanently bans public health taxes on e-cigarettes, giving a huge tax loophole to Big Tobacco.

Measure 103 is retroactive, going back in time to roll back services:

- Constitutional experts say that Measure 103 will cut **existing** healthcare funding for Oregon families.
- Measure 103 potentially rolls back locally approved measures that fund schools, healthcare, parks, and more — no one can say how many cities are impacted by Measure 103 (1).

The proponents of 103 claim they wanted a narrowly defined and drafted measure, but legal documents from the Attorney General and Oregon Supreme Court show they do not understand the depth, flaws and impact of their measure (2).

Sincerely,

Former Oregon Supreme Court Justice Bill Riggs

Citations:

(1) Official Financial Estimate Statement, <https://sos.oregon.gov/elections/Documents/fec/Official-Financial-Estimate-Statement-IP-37.pdf>

(2) DOJ File #BT-37-17; Elections Division #2018-037, "Re: Proposed Initiative Petition — Amends Constitution: Prohibits Taxes/Fees Based on Transactions for "Groceries" (Defined) Enacted or Amended After September 2017," Available via <http://oregonvotes.org/irr/2018/037cvt.pdf>

(This information furnished by Elisabeth Swarttouw, Vote No on 104: Protect Oregon's Constitution.)

Argument in Opposition

Join Community of Color Led Organizations: Vote No on 103

We are community-based organizations with representation from diverse communities of color across Oregon.

All of us work to address economic disparities, institutional racism and the inequity of services experienced by our families, children and communities.

We are urging a **No Vote on 103** because the measure is **deeply flawed and unnecessary**.

Oregon doesn't have a sales tax on groceries and no one is proposing one. We recognize the importance of making sure families can afford necessities, but this measure will not do that.

We also reject any tokenization in the proponents' campaign with the use of images of people of color and other marginalized community members to make the claim that the measure will benefit our communities.

This measure will not make essential items cheaper for Oregon families.

Instead, because it is **retroactive**, it may repeal part of the funding Oregon voters overwhelmingly approved this year to protect families from **losing their health care**.

Measure 103 also strips control away from communities to decide their own futures, banning cities and counties from passing certain policies. Voters know what is best for their own communities, and we can't let special interests ban our ability to pass impactful, equitable, and community-led policies at the local level.

The bottom line: Measure 103 would make it harder to support efforts to advance racial justice and improve outcomes for communities of color.

Join us in rejecting this misleading and retroactive measure.

Vote No on Measure 103.

Coalition of Communities of Color

Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO)

Causa

Familias en Acción

Hacienda CDC

Forward Together

NAACP Portland Chapter

Pineros y Campesinos del Noroeste (PCUN)

Unite Oregon

Verde

(This information furnished by Jenny Lee, Coalition of Communities of Color.)

Argument in Opposition

The Welcome Home Coalition Urges a Yes on 102 and No on 103

The Welcome Home Coalition is made up of over 60 diverse organizations of affordable housing owners, developers and operators; homeless service providers and anti-poverty organizations; culturally specific organizations; and groups committed to racial equity in housing, transit justice, and faith groups.

In communities in every corner of the state, Oregonians face a housing crisis. Too many families can't find a home they can afford. Communities of color are being priced out and displaced. There is an increase in individuals and working families experiencing homelessness.

There are many factors driving the housing affordability problem - wages aren't keeping pace with the cost of housing, rents continue to rise, and there's a shortage of affordable homes.

As we work together to find solutions to the housing crisis, we need to focus on getting more people in stable homes.

We need to pass Measure 102 and we need to defeat Measure 103.

Measure 103 does not work for Oregon. It is so flawed that it would make our housing crisis worse.

This unnecessary and flawed measure is so poorly written that even the proponents aren't sure of all it does and who will be impacted.

What we do know is that Measure 103 would amend our constitution and harm our local communities' ability to fund housing, health care, transportation and other vital services for Oregon families.

We should only amend our constitution to fix urgent problems - like the state-wide housing crisis. And that's why Oregonians should vote **yes on Measure 102**, a proposal, supported by Democrats and Republicans alike, that would make our affordable housing dollars go further and get more Oregon families into stable homes.

We cannot afford to be distracted by Measure 103 and this special interest scheme. We need more stable and affordable housing now.

We need to vote Yes on 102 & No on Measure 103.

(This information furnished by Kari Lyons, Director, Welcome Home Coalition.)

Argument in Opposition

Don't change the constitution: Vote NO on 103, 104 and 106

As a former Oregon Supreme Court Justice and a judge for over 40 years, I relied on our state constitution to protect your rights.

Now, Measures 103, 104 and 106 want to make pointless, risky and misleading changes to our state constitution. We should not change the constitution unless there is an urgent, major reason to do so.

103 creates permanent tax loopholes for special interests that are not that urgent, vital or important.

There is no amendment like Measure 103 in any state in the country. Measure 103 locks a series of complicated changes into our constitution. The authors of the bill, lobbyists that work in Salem, cannot agree on the impact of the measure. The Attorney General and the Oregon Supreme Court found a number of impacts of Measure 103 that the authors didn't intend, including provisions that make it impossible to lower taxes for food-related businesses, and rollbacks to healthcare funding for Oregon families.

While some research has been done into the impact of Measure 103, no one will know exactly what this measure does until years of court cases are resolved about its intent and impact.

Measures 104 and 106 are equally dangerous:

104 is an unnecessary expansion of Oregon's supermajority requirement that would extend far beyond protections for taxpayers: it will lead to legislative gridlock, likely forcing cuts on services like K-12 schools and Medicaid.

106 would permanently amend the Oregon constitution and set a dangerous precedent by allowing special interests to decide which medical procedures insurance can or can't cover, permanently restricting access to reproductive health-care for hundreds of thousands of vulnerable Oregonians.

As a judge, I can tell you that these changes to our constitution are pointless, risky, misleading and wrong.

Oregon's Constitution should not be a testing ground for special interest experimentation.

Join me in rejecting dangerous constitutional amendments. Vote No on 103, 104 and 106.

(This information furnished by Elisabeth Swarttouw, on behalf of Retired Supreme Court Judge Bill Riggs.)

Argument in Opposition

Partners for a Hunger-Free Oregon and the Farmers Market Fund urge a No vote on 103

All Oregonians deserve access to affordable, nutritious food. Our two organizations work to end hunger in Oregon.

Farmers Market Fund: We are dedicated to providing underserved populations greater access to nutritious, locally grown food.

Partners for a Hunger-Free Oregon: We advocate for systemic changes and better access to food because we believe everyone has the right to be free from hunger.

As anti-hunger advocates, we feel it is our obligation to speak out when we see campaigns using the faces of hunger to their own advantage. That is why we oppose Measure 103.

No one wants groceries to be more expensive, but Measure 103 doesn't do anything to help families who are struggling to put healthy food on the table. When you look beyond the slogans, this campaign seems designed to help those who own stores, more than people buying groceries. In reality, Measure 103 causes far more problems than it solves.

Measure 103:

- Cements unnecessary and flawed changes into our Constitution.
- Is retroactive, meaning it will reverse laws passed in cities and counties that are already helping fund local programs and priorities.
- Is misleading, because it defines "groceries" as things that really aren't groceries, such as fast-food meals and e-cigarettes.

Measure 103 takes Oregon a step backward in the mission to solve hunger in our state. **Please join anti-hunger advocates in voting NO on this deceptive and misguided measure.**

(This information furnished by Annie Kirschner, Partners for a Hunger Free Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Workers Strongly Oppose Constitutional Amendment 103

Constitutional Amendment 103 does not benefit working people in Oregon and should be opposed by voters. Amending Oregon's Constitution should only be done when there is an urgent, major program and Amendment 103 does not meet that criteria. This measure would bring significant risk to workers and would endanger the way our state makes laws that benefit working families.

Constitutional Amendment 103 is risky, misleading and wholly unnecessary. This measure would add broad, permanent and untested tax loopholes for specific businesses into Oregon's Constitution. The truth is, there is no tax on groceries and this measure is so broad that it actually fails to protect items working families use every day – like soap, diapers and medicine. We don't need this risky and misleading amendment forced into our Constitution.

Oregon's voters who are concerned about the livelihood of working people should VOTE NO on Constitutional Amendment 103.

(This information furnished by Tom Chamberlain, Oregon AFL-CIO.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 103 is filled with flaws that make it unfit to be in our constitution:

Misleading definition of "groceries"

- Measure 103 defines groceries in a way you'd never find in the dictionary. This means transactions involving slaughterhouses, processing plants, wholesalers, and restaurants, hotels or sporting events would all be tax exempt. Meanwhile, essential grocery items like toilet paper, diapers, medicine and hygiene products are not considered "groceries," and could be taxed under Measure 103.

Hurts public health

- The definition of "groceries" in Measure 103 includes e-cigarettes and vaping products. That means Measure 103 would constitutionally ban any state or local consumption taxes on e-cigarettes or vaping products. It also repeals part of two provider assessments that voters approved in January to fund Medicaid.

Makes it harder to repair roads and bridges

- Measure 103 applies to the "transfer," or distribution, of "groceries," which means that the transport of food-grade items would be exempt from any taxation enacted after September 2017. This will affect future fuel and weight-per-mile taxes, making it harder to fund essential improvements to our state infrastructure.

Harms our environment

- If Measure 103 passed, the state legislature could not extend a carbon fee on factory farms, truckers, grocers, fast food chains, restaurants, wholesalers and more.

Takes control away from local communities

- Ashland and Yachats have existing restaurant taxes, which could remain in place. But those jurisdictions could never raise or lower those taxes.
- Other cities and counties would be barred from ever creating a tourism tax that taxes food sold at restaurants or hotels. This harms local communities trying to fund affordable housing and other priorities.

Prohibits lowering certain taxes & fees

- Measure 103 is a prohibition on enacting and amending taxes on the sale or transfer of "groceries." That means that existing taxes on those transactions could never be lowered.

A measure this flawed does not belong in Oregon's constitution.

Vote No on Measure 103.

(This information furnished by Thomas K Adamson, No on Measure 103: Unnecessary, Misleading, Risky.)

Argument in Opposition

Las organizaciones Latinxs en Oregon proponen que digas
NO en las medidas 103 y 104

Causa

PCUN

Verde

Las medidas 103 y 104 perjudican a nuestras comunidades en vez de ayudar a crear las escuelas, cuidado de salud, casas y trabajos que merecemos, estas medidas amenazan a la democracia creando más confusión.

Las medidas 103 y 104 son:

Innecesarias - Porque desperdician tiempo y dinero resolviendo problemas que no existen.

Engañosas - No creas nada de lo que dicen, estas medidas no hacen nada para ayudar a nuestras familias.

Malgastadoras - Hace que sea mucho más difícil reducir el gasto público y centrarse en los servicios que realmente importan.

Defectuosas - Las medidas tienen tantos errores que llevarían décadas arreglarlos.

Permanentes - Estaría en la constitución de Oregon, así que quedaríamos atados con esas medidas.

¡Apoya a la comunidad y vota NO en las medidas 103 y 104!

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Causa Oregon.)

Proposed by initiative petition to be voted on at the General Election, November 6, 2018.

Measure No.

104

Amends Constitution: Expands (beyond taxes) application of requirement that three-fifths legislative majority approve bills raising revenue

Estimate of Financial Impact	79
Text of Measure	80
Explanatory Statement	80
Arguments in Favor	81
Arguments in Opposition	88

Ballot Title Caption

Amends Constitution: Expands (beyond taxes) application of requirement that three-fifths legislative majority approve bills raising revenue

Result of "Yes" Vote

"Yes" vote expands "bills for raising revenue," which require three-fifths legislative majority, to include (beyond taxes) fees and changes to tax exemptions, deductions, credits.

Result of "No" Vote

"No" vote retains current law that bills for raising revenue, which require three-fifths legislative majority, are limited to bills that levy/increase taxes.

Summary

The Oregon Constitution provides that "bills for raising revenue" require the approval of three-fifths of each house of the legislature. The constitution does not currently define "raising revenue." Oregon courts have interpreted that term to include bills that bring money into the state treasury by levying or increasing a tax. Under that interpretation, a bill imposing a fee for a specific purpose or in exchange for some benefit or service is not included. Nor is a bill that reduces or eliminates tax exemptions. Proposed measure amends constitution and defines "raising revenue" to include any tax or fee increase, including changes to tax exemptions, deductions, or credits. Measure expands three-fifths legislative majority requirement to also apply to such bills.

Estimate of Financial Impact

State Government: The financial impact to state revenue and expenditures is indeterminate.

Local Government: The financial impact to local government revenue and expenditures is indeterminate.

Committee Members:

Secretary of State Dennis Richardson
 State Treasurer Tobias Read
 Katy Coba, Director, Department of Administrative Services
 Nia Ray, Director, Department of Revenue
 Debra Grabler, Local Government Representative

(The estimate of financial impact was provided by the above committee pursuant to ORS 250.127.)

Text of Measure

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

Paragraph 1. Section 25, Article IV of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, is amended to read:

Section 25. (1) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (2) of this section, a majority of all the members elected to each House shall be necessary to pass every bill or Joint resolution.

(2) Three-fifths of all members elected to each House shall be necessary to pass bills for raising revenue.

(3) All bills, and Joint resolutions passed, shall be signed by the presiding officers of the respective houses.

(4) As used in subsection (2) of this section, "raising revenue" means any tax or fee increase, whether accomplished by the creation, imposition or increase of any tax or fee, or by the modification, elimination or change in eligibility for any exemption, credit, deduction or lower rate of taxation.

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

Explanatory Statement

Ballot Measure 104 amends the Oregon Constitution to define and expand the kinds of bills that are considered "bills for raising revenue" that require the approval of a three-fifths majority of all members of each house of the Legislative Assembly.

Currently, the Oregon Constitution requires bills for raising revenue to receive three-fifths vote of approval in each house, but the Constitution does not further explain what a bill for raising revenue is. Oregon courts have said a bill for raising revenue must do two things: The bill must collect or bring money into the treasury and either impose a new tax or increase the rate of an existing tax. Similarly, a bill that creates or increases a fee is not considered a bill for raising revenue under current law. Likewise, the elimination of a tax exemption or deduction is not considered a bill for raising revenue. Ballot Measure 104 adds a definition of "raising revenue" to the Constitution. Under the measure, a bill is considered to be raising revenue if it results in a tax or fee increase through the (1) creation of a new tax or fee; (2) increase the rate of an existing tax or fee; or (3) modification, elimination or change in the eligibility for any exemption, credit, deduction or lower rate of taxation. Under any of those circumstances, the measure would require the bill to be approved by a three-fifths majority of all members in each house of the Legislative Assembly.

Committee Members:

Paul Cosgrove
Shaun Jillions
Becca Uherbelau
Harry Wilson
Mick Gillette

Appointed by:

Chief Petitioners
Chief Petitioners
Secretary of State
Secretary of State
Members of the Committee

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

Argument in Favor

PROTECT AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND JOBS FOR MORE THAN 100,000 OREGON CONSTRUCTION WORKERS

Measure 104 fixes a loophole that politicians have created in the State Constitution that leaves Oregon homeowners and small businesses vulnerable to unfair tax hikes

If Oregonians learned anything from the Great Recession it should be that instability in the housing market can have devastating impacts on our economy. But, last year the Oregon legislature attempted to do away with the ability of many taxpayers to deduct mortgage interest and property taxes on their state income tax returns.

Achieving the dream of home ownership is already a struggle for many. **Eliminating the mortgage or property tax deductions could have devastating impacts on the ability of middle-class families to afford the purchase of a home.** As hard-working men and women in the construction industry, we understand the challenges that many families face, unable to keep up with rising housing costs.

The worst part is that **politicians attempted to increase the cost by exploiting a loophole in the Oregon Constitution.** That loophole is one of the biggest reasons Oregonians should pass Measure 104.

Politician's abuse of our State Constitution doesn't end there. Earlier this year, the legislature robbed thousands of small contractors of recent federal tax cuts by disconnecting from the federal tax code. **The tax increase will cost small businesses over \$244 million in the next two years and it was done without a three-fifths supermajority.**

Then in another brazen attempt to get around the three-fifths supermajority requirement, **legislators proposed a new "energy fee" that would have cost Oregon businesses and utility rate payers more than \$1 billion.** Any legislation that costs Oregonians \$1 billion clearly should require a three-fifths supermajority.

We must vote YES on Measure 104 and stop hidden tax increases

Associated General Contractors Oregon-Columbia Chapter
Oregon Home Builders Association

Associated Builders and Contractors Pacific Northwest Chapter
Independent Electrical Contractors of Oregon

(This information furnished by Carol Russell, Oregonians for Affordable Housing.)

Argument in Favor

The Oregon Farm Bureau encourages you to VOTE YES ON 104

Oregon family farmers and ranchers are proud to grow local food that sustains Oregon families from our farms to your table.

But, it's not easy. Considering that over 80% of Oregon farm products leave the state, local farmers are competing with growers from around the world. Competition is fierce and consumers expect the lowest price. **When Oregon legislators raise taxes on Oregon family farmers it makes survival difficult.** Even a little tax increase can have a devastating impact on our ability to compete globally.

In recent years, proposed tax increases on Oregon farmers have been anything but little. The Oregon Constitution says a three-fifths majority is needed to raise taxes. Unfortunately, under the current language courts have allowed **legislators to keep raising taxes despite this supermajority requirement. Measure 104 closes the loopholes and strengthens the Constitution.** Here are a few examples:

- The legislature tried to eliminate critical personal property tax exemptions for farm, irrigation, and forestry equipment. The proposal would have robbed Oregon's farmers, ranchers, and foresters of a tax exemption for equipment we depend on and could have reduced our ability to purchase and maintain equipment necessary to grow farm fresh food. *(HB2859, 2017)*
- Salem politicians targeted our smallest farmers, ranchers, and loggers in an attempt to exclude them from a small business tax rate reduction. The legislature voted to increase taxes on seasonal farms and logging operations by at least \$196 million without a supermajority vote. *(HB 2060, 2017)*
- In 2018, the legislature struck again, rejecting a federal tax deduction benefiting small businesses organized as pass-through entities, stealing more than \$1 billion from small businesses, including farmers and ranchers. *(SB 1528, 2018)*

That's why voting YES on MEASURE 104 is an easy choice. It ends easy tax hikes on Oregon family farmers keeping farms local and growing into the future.

Please join the Oregon Farm Bureau and VOTE YES on MEASURE 104.

(This information furnished by David M Dillon, Oregon Farm Bureau Federation.)

Argument in Favor

REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRAT LEADERS AGREE:

Measure 104 Protects Oregon Families from Easy Tax Hikes

As Democrats and Republicans it goes without saying that we don't see eye-to-eye on every issue. But we all agree that Measure 104 protects Oregon taxpayers and ensures that the legislature works in a more cooperative and bipartisan manner.

Measure 104 protects the will of Oregon voters

For years it was understood that any legislation that increased taxes required a three-fifths supermajority. But through a series of backroom deals and manipulation, politicians have created new loopholes that put families at risk.

Measure 104 closes the loophole that has let legislators get around the existing constitutional requirement for a supermajority to raise your taxes. It sends a message to legislators that you are paying attention and won't accept these kinds of political games.

Measure 104 protects Oregon families

Some legislators are pushing to do away with important deductions like your ability to deduct charitable contributions, mortgage interest and property taxes on your Oregon income tax returns. These deductions encourage charitable giving and help keep homeownership within reach for many families. Taking them away on a simple majority vote should never be allowed – but it's exactly what many politicians are already trying to do.

Measure 104 encourages consensus and bipartisanship

Today, thanks to the extreme politics that is present in both major parties, good compromise is no longer an objective. Requiring a three-fifths supermajority to raise taxes means legislators are encouraged to seek bipartisan support. Measure 104 will force legislators to work across party lines and – hopefully – put an end to the bickering and divisiveness that have become too common in the legislative process.

PLEASE JOIN US IN VOTING YES ON MEASURE 104

Former Democratic State Senator Joanne Verger
Republican State Representative Bill Kennemer
Democratic State Representative Deborah Boone

Former Republican State Senator Frank Morse

Former Democratic State Representative Mike Schauler

Former Republican State Representative Bruce Hanna

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

Clackamas County Farmers and Small Businesses

Urge You to VOTE YES on Measure 104

Collectively, our organizations represent hundreds of small businesses throughout Clackamas County. Our members work hard to provide jobs to local families but are often the hardest hit by new schemes to raise taxes. Case in point – last year legislators raised taxes on Oregon small businesses to the tune of over \$244 million.

Voters amended the Oregon Constitution in 1996 to require a three-fifths supermajority on legislation that increased taxes. We recognized that raising taxes – particularly on small businesses – should clear a higher bar than regular legislation.

Twenty years later, politicians in Salem have invented loopholes and orchestrated backroom deals to weaken its effectiveness. Today, the legislature regularly ignores the will of Oregon voters and passes revenue-raising legislation on a simple majority vote.

Measure 104 provides us with an opportunity to close those loopholes and protect Oregon families, farmers and small businesses.

Measure 104 is very simple: It says that any legislation that raises revenue should require a three-fifths supermajority. It won't harm funding for any existing programs. Instead it ensures that proposals that increase revenue are held to a higher threshold and have broad support.

Please join our organizations in supporting Measure 104 and end easy tax hikes on local small businesses.

Sincerely,

North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce

Clackamas County Farm Bureau

Molalla Chamber of Commerce

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

The Oregon Trucking Association Supports Measure 104

Vote "Yes" and Stop Unfair Taxes on Consumer Products

Since 1937, our member's employees have been safely traveling roads throughout Oregon, delivering freight, such as apparel, building materials, electronic devices, gas, groceries, and medicine for small businesses and families.

Our commitment to you? To keep delivery costs as low as possible.

Unfortunately, recent attempts by **politicians to create new or increased taxes, fees and assessments on a simple-majority vote threaten to increase the cost of consumer products.**

What's at Stake? Despite a strong economy and record state revenue, Oregon politicians and their lawyers have found creative loopholes to raise taxes and eliminate exemptions, deductions, and credits on small businesses and families without the constitutionally-required supermajority vote.

A Recent and unfortunate example –

In the 2018 Legislative Session, Oregon politicians targeted more than 250,000 small businesses with a **\$1 billion tax increase on a simple-majority vote**, eliminating tax breaks for hardworking, family-owned businesses even though they are available for large, often out of state, corporations. *(Senate Bill 1528)*

Measure 104 will close loopholes and protect the will of the voters –

For years it was understood that any legislation that raised revenue required a three-fifths supermajority. Now, politicians are **trying to change the rules** to make it easier to increase revenue, despite record state revenue. This measure protects the will of voters and prevents politicians from raising revenue without the constitutionally required supermajority vote.

Measure 104 will encourage accountability and consensus politics –

This measure will increase accountability and encourage bipartisan consensus by asking politicians to work across party lines when it comes time to raise revenue. Not only will this protect you from easy tax hikes, it will make sure that funding is being prioritized on issues important to small businesses and Oregon families.

PLEASE JOIN US IN VOTING YES ON MEASURE 104

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

The Oregon State Chamber of Commerce

Urges a 'YES' vote on Measure 104

The Oregon State Chamber of Commerce (OSCC), representing Oregon's small businesses, nonprofits, community organizations and citizens strongly urges a **"YES" vote on Measure 104.**

OSCC members believe that a healthy business climate and the jobs that such a business climate creates, is the key to building up local communities, adequately funding social services, and making Oregon prosperous. OSCC is organized to give a voice to local business communities throughout Oregon in support of policies that enable business success and job growth in every corner of Oregon. That is why we are supporting Measure 104.

OSCC stands with businesses and families.

By supporting Measure 104, we reaffirm the decision made by Oregon voters over 20 years ago—that any legislation that raises revenue requires a three-fifths supermajority vote. This includes fees or the elimination of tax exemptions, deductions, or credits.

Measure 104 ends unnecessary tax hikes.

In recent years, politicians and their lawyers have worked hard to find loopholes around the three-fifths supermajority requirement in order to pass unnecessary tax hikes instead of reigning in spending. Measure 104 sends a clear message that Oregonians are done with politicians working behind closed doors to increase taxes.

A 'YES' vote on Measure 104 will end the game-playing we've seen over the last few years by politicians in Salem and ensure that there is bipartisan discussion and support for any new revenue for the state.

Voting 'YES' on Measure 104 sends a clear message that Oregonians meant it when they said that any legislation that raises taxes should require a three-fifths supermajority.

**Join the Oregon State Chamber
in taking a stand against tax hikes.**

Vote YES on Measure 104.

**Oregon State Chamber of Commerce
Albany Area Chamber of Commerce
Hermiston Chamber of Commerce
The Dalles Area Chamber of Commerce
Tualatin Chamber of Commerce
Wilsonville Area Chamber of Commerce**

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

BALLOT MEASURE 104 PROTECTS OREGON SMALL BUSINESSES FROM HIGHER TAXES AND EXORBITANT FEES

In 1996, Oregon voters passed an amendment to the Oregon Constitution requiring a three-fifths supermajority on measures raising revenue.

Sadly, politicians have invented creative loopholes to get around the will of Oregon voters. Now, the legislature is making it harder to do business in Oregon by raising fees and increasing taxes on small businesses without the three-fifths supermajority approved by voters.

Earlier this year, the legislature unnecessarily denied tax relief to hundreds of thousands of Oregon small businesses by disconnecting from the federal tax code – **increasing taxes on small businesses by over \$244 million on a simple majority vote.** (SB 1528, 2018) And in 2017, the legislature attempted to increase taxes on tens of thousands of small businesses with fewer than 10 employees without a three-fifths supermajority vote. (HB 2060, 2017)

Small businesses need a tax system that is fair and predictable, so they can confidently keep the doors open for business in Oregon, create good paying jobs, and invest in their local communities.

It's time that we put an end to backroom deals that raise taxes on Oregon small businesses without the required supermajority vote.

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS ENCOURAGES YOU TO VOTE YES ON MEASURE 104

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

The Coos-Curry and Multnomah County Farm Bureaus Urge a YES vote on Measure 104

The Coos-Curry and Multnomah County Farm Bureaus are chapters of the Oregon Farm Bureau, a grassroots, nonpartisan, nonprofit organization representing the interests of the farming and ranching families and the Oregonians they employ.

Oregon farmers are blessed with a rich agricultural bounty, with over 220 different commodities raised here. We provide over 326,627 full and part-time jobs that sustain rural communities, and provide healthy, responsibly grown food to our local markets. However, with 80% of our commodities leaving the state, our survival is based on competitive prices in the global market.

Recent partisan political decisions have increased regulations and taxes on small farming and ranching businesses making it harder to compete, having a staggering impact.

The Problem: Political Loopholes

Over 20 years ago, Oregon voters required a three-fifths supermajority vote of the legislature to raise revenue. Since then, politicians have created a legal loophole to raise revenue without the required three-fifths supermajority vote. In 2017 alone, the legislature voted to increase taxes on seasonal farms and logging operations by at least \$196 billion without the required supermajority vote. Not only is this unfair, it jeopardizes our local farmers' economic competitiveness and ability to keep healthy, local food on the plates of Oregonians.

The Solution: Vote YES on Measure 104

Measure 104 will close this loophole and put an end to easy tax hikes. By allowing families to invest in their farms, Oregon's small farms and ranches have an opportunity to engage on a level playing field to continue to provide healthy, responsibly grown food to our local markets.

Oregon farms define our landscape. They grow our food, and sustain rural economies.

End easy tax hikes on Oregon farmers.

Please join the Coos-Curry and Multnomah County Farm Bureaus and

Vote YES on Measure 104

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

Measure 104 is important to Oregon small businesses

Small businesses are often the hardest hit by new taxes and fees. Big corporations and their lobbyists always manage to shift the burden to someone else. **Measure 104 will level the playing field and create more tax fairness in Oregon.**

Consider that small businesses in Oregon pay a higher tax rate than large corporations. While you'd expect politicians to work toward addressing that balance they did the exact opposite last year, targeting small business with a tax increase. Despite a strong economy and record revenue, **legislators robbed small businesses, taking away federal tax cuts while letting large corporations keep virtually all of theirs.**

The result – Oregon politicians ignored the three-fifths supermajority requirement and hit small businesses with an unfair \$1 billion tax increase.

With profits for fuel stations like ours at razor thin margins, we need certainty. The ability of politicians to easily change tax policy on a whim isn't just disruptive – it's destructive to small businesses.

But, it's not always just taxes. It's easy to dismiss fees as a small or insignificant price of doing business. That's often not the case. Just last year, **legislators pushed a \$1.4 billion new tax but avoided the three-fifth supermajority requirement by calling it a "fee" rather than the tax that it was.**

That's wrong and it ignores the spirit of our Constitution. **Who in their right mind could argue that a \$1.4 billion revenue increase should be able to avoid a three-fifths supermajority?**

Measure 104 addresses this by making clear what legislators fail to recognize: A tax is a tax.

It will close the loophole and require that 'all revenue raising' proposals be approved by a supermajority.

Please join me and other Oregon small businesses in fighting for fairness. Vote YES on Measure 104.

Sincerely,

Lila Leathers-Fitz, President & CEO, Leathers Fuels

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

A MESSAGE FROM THE OREGON SPORTSMEN ASSOCIATION

The Oregon Legislature raised over 580 taxes and fees in 2017.

The cost of fishing fees, hunting fees, camping fees and park fees all went up.

The politicians are passing too many taxes and fees too fast. The middle class can't afford to enjoy the Oregon outdoors. It shouldn't only be for the rich who are able to afford these Oregon treasures.

The Oregon Sportsmen Association supports Measure 104 so all Oregonians can enjoy the great outdoors.

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

JOIN OREGON'S AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY

VOTE YES ON MEASURE 104

MEASURE 104 WILL PROTECT SMALL AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES

In Oregon, there are more than 34,600 farms and ranches creating jobs in local communities, making the agricultural industry one of the state's top economic drivers.

Unfortunately, Oregon's farmers and ranchers have been under siege by politicians, making it harder to do business by raising fees and increasing taxes without the required supermajority.

- In 2017, politicians tried to eliminate critical personal property tax exemptions for farm irrigation, and forestry equipment. This would have taken away resources Oregon's farmers, ranchers, and foresters depend on to purchase and maintain equipment necessary to growing fresh food and fiber. *(House Bill 2859)*
- That same year politicians targeted our smallest farmers, ranchers, and loggers in an attempt to take away tax breaks for small businesses. They **attempted to increase taxes by \$196 million** on seasonal farms and logging operations. *(House Bill 2050)*

Shamelessly politicians attempted to pass these proposals that raised revenue **with a simple majority – not the supermajority envisioned by voters.**

In 2018 they succeeded... Salem politicians passed a **\$1 billion tax increase** on farmers and small businesses **without the constitutionally required supermajority.** *(Senate Bill 1528)*

This reckless legislative act has the ability to lead to **higher consumer costs** and the loss of jobs. Join us in **closing the loophole and protecting all Oregonians from unfair tax hikes.**

MEASURE 104 WILL ENSURE TAX FAIRNESS

Unable to live within their budget, **politicians created a loophole** to get around the state's constitutional requirement for a supermajority, making it easier to raise taxes on Oregon families and small businesses. Measure 104 will **close this loophole** and make sure politicians follow the state constitution and **live within their budget**, just like you do.

HELP PUT AN END TO EASY TAX HIKES!

PLEASE JOIN US IN SUPPORTING MEASURE 104:

- Oregon Cattlemen's Association
- Oregon Dairy Farmers Association
- Oregon Wheat Growers League
- Oregon Nurseries' PAC

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

PROTECT SMALL BUSINESSES & STOP THE POLITICAL GAMES

VOTE YES ON MEASURE 104 TO END EASY TAXES

The Problem

In 1996, Oregon voters passed an amendment to the Oregon Constitution requiring a three-fifths supermajority to raise revenue. **Now, politicians and legislative lawyers in Oregon are changing the rules, making it easier to raise your taxes.**

Oregon politicians **increased taxes on more than 250,000 small businesses** earlier this year by stealing federal tax cuts designed to help create jobs and grow the economy. On a simple-majority vote, politicians **increased state revenue by \$1 billion** at the expense of hardworking small businesses.

By making it harder and more expensive to do business in Oregon, companies creating local jobs will be forced to increase prices, reduce employment, or leave the state to do business elsewhere.

The Solution

Measure 104 will close this loophole and require that all revenue raising legislation (such as eliminating tax deductions and credits important to Oregon small businesses) require a three-fifth legislative majority for approval.

Measure 104 will protect small businesses from politicians who are using legislative tricks and gimmicks to raise taxes without a three-fifths majority, by increasing fees on small businesses and eliminating important deductions for middle class families.

How Can You Help?

Vote **YES on Measure 104** and send a message to politicians that increasing taxes on Oregonians shouldn't happen with a simple majority vote. Help us close this loophole and restore tax certainty and fairness for small businesses. It's time we restore accountability and trust in Oregon and put an end to political tricks.

A "Yes" vote will help protect you from unnecessary tax increases.

CLOSE THE LOOPHOLE: JOIN MEMBERS OF THE OREGON SMALL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION AND VOTE VOTE YES ON MEASURE 104

(This information furnished by TJ Reilly, President, Oregon Small Business Association.)

Argument in Favor

OREGON FAMILY FARMS SUPPORT MEASURE 104

It is clear that Salem politicians are desperate to find more ways to tax Oregon families in order to fix the budget mess that they created. They are so desperate, that they are threatening Oregon farmers with tax increases and elimination of important property tax deductions. In order to do it, they are creating loopholes in the Oregon Constitution.

These loopholes are threatening the ability of many local family farmers to stay in business.

Last year, the legislature attempted to **eliminate critical personal property tax exemptions for farm, irrigation and forestry equipment** (House Bill 2859). They did it knowing full well that the added expense would create a devastating burden for our agricultural community.

But they didn't stop there.

They also **targeted our smallest farmers, ranchers and loggers in an attempt to exclude them from small business tax cuts. This included a \$196 million tax increase on seasonal farms and logging operations** (House Bill 2060, 2017).

Instead of following the Oregon Constitution, they are pushing these tax increases with a simple majority vote – not the three-fifths supermajority envisioned by Oregon voters.

MEASURE 104 IS THE SOLUTION – It closes these loopholes by clarifying that a three-fifths supermajority vote is needed to increase taxes, fees, or make changes to tax exemptions or deductions. It protects Oregon taxpayers. It ensures that broad bi-partisan support is required before politicians can increase taxes on Oregon's family farmers.

Join us and the thousands of family farmers in Oregon by voting YES on Measure 104

Oregon Family Farm Association PAC

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

Support Measure 104: Stop Easy Tax Hikes on Food, Beverages, and Lodging!

Oregon has a strong track record of enhancing tourism and creating thousands of jobs that trigger local economic growth while making Oregon a top travel destination. **That is why we are supporting Measure 104** – it will ensure tax fairness for businesses and consumers.

Join the Oregon Restaurant & Lodging Association and **protect the entrepreneurial spirit** that brings award-winning plates from chefs who use Oregon's farm fresh marionberries and hazelnuts, salmon and crab and thousands of handcrafted beers and wines.

Unfortunately, this entrepreneurial spirit is under attack.

New taxes on beer, coffee, food, and soda have become common amongst politicians in Salem, as they **search for new revenue, despite record spending levels.**

How are politicians gaming the system and getting around the law?

Over 20 years ago Oregon voters passed a constitutional amendment requiring a supermajority vote on all revenue-raising legislation. But now, thanks to a creative loophole found by politicians and their lawyers, politicians have changed the rules to avoid the supermajority vote designed to protect taxpayers from increased taxes on food and beverages.

This year, **politicians used this trick to steal \$1 billion from small businesses** on a simple-majority vote, eliminating lower tax rates for hardworking, family-owned businesses throughout Oregon. **That isn't right and it needs to be stopped.**

A "Yes" vote on Measure 104 will close this loophole and put an end to these legislative tricks hurting consumers and businesses.

Supporting Measure 104 will help **prevent partisan gamesmanship and ensure tax fairness** for Oregonians. Join us in protecting the Oregon way and the entrepreneurial spirit that makes Oregon a great place to live, visit, work and play.

The Oregon Restaurant & Lodging Association encourages a "Yes" vote on Measure 104.

(This information furnished by Jason Brandt, Oregon Restaurant & Lodging Association.)

Argument in Favor

MARION COUNTY SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS, FARMERS AND RANCHERS URGE A "YES" VOTE ON MEASURE 104

When Oregon voters passed a constitutional amendment in 1996 requiring a supermajority vote on revenue raising legislation, it was intended to ensure that any legislation that takes money out of the pockets of hard-working Oregonians required a three-fifths supermajority vote.

Since then, politicians in Salem have been hard at work creating loopholes to allow them to ignore the supermajority requirement and **raise taxes and fees and eliminate sacred exemptions, deductions, and credits on a simple majority vote.**

This year they attempted to rob Oregon small businesses, farmers, and ranchers of millions of dollars.

First, they attempted to pass legislation on a simple majority vote that would have raised \$1 billion in revenue and **increased utility bills for Oregonians and small businesses** (HB 4001, 2018).

Then they attempted to **eliminate property tax exemptions for farm and forest equipment and deferrals** (HB 2859, 2017). With equipment costs continuing to increase, the loss of this exemption would be devastating to Oregon's small farmers and ranchers – and the worst part is that our legislature tried to do it with only a simple majority vote.

HOW WILL MEASURE 104 SOLVE THIS?

Measure 104 makes it crystal clear that any revenue raising legislation, including fees or the elimination of tax exemptions, deductions or credits requires a three-fifths supermajority vote.

It protects Oregonian's paychecks and stops politicians from gaming the system in order to pass hidden tax increases.

Measure 104 will close the loophole and protect Oregon's small businesses, farmers and ranchers.

Join us in voting YES on Measure 104

Marion County Farm Bureau

Keizer Area Chamber of Commerce

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

A YES VOTE ON MEASURE 104 WILL PROTECT FAMILY WAGE JOBS IN OREGON

Manufacturers provide stable, high-wage jobs in communities across the state. They are jobs that can lead to homeownership, college tuition for kids, and savings for retirement. Manufacturing is also vital for small businesses that provide parts, services and transportation of goods in each and every urban and rural county in Oregon.

The Oregon Constitution currently requires a three-fifths supermajority vote in the Oregon State Legislature in order to raise taxes. But this hasn't stopped politicians from finding creative loopholes around the requirement, so they can raise taxes and fees with just a simple majority vote. Allowing them to raise taxes and fees without broad, bipartisan support puts current and future jobs at serious risk.

In just the last three years, Salem politicians successfully raised taxes by over \$1 billion on small businesses and proposed hundreds of millions in new taxes and fees on Oregon manufacturers, which they argued only needed a simple majority vote to pass.

Manufacturers are constantly being recruited to locate in other states. If Oregon politicians are allowed to raise taxes whenever they want, it makes it more and more difficult to remain competitive in Oregon.

Measure 104 simply closes the loopholes created by politicians and their lawyers. It clarifies the current requirement that Oregon voters approved that they need a three-fifths vote in order to raise taxes or fees, ensuring that these decisions are thoughtful and have broad support.

Stable, high-wage jobs are what builds families and community. We need to close the tax-raising loopholes and protect Oregon jobs. That's why Oregon Manufacturers and Commerce, our state's leading association dedicated to promoting, protecting, and advancing Oregon manufacturers and their allied partners in commerce supports Ballot Measures 104.

OREGON MANUFACTURERS ENCOURAGE YOU TO VOTE YES ON MEASURE 104

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

PROTECT HOMEOWNERSHIP Vote YES on Measure 104

As Realtors, we walk alongside Oregonians as they pursue the 'American Dream' of homeownership. But politicians in Salem continue to threaten the opportunity for middle-class families to achieve homeownership by attempting to eliminate important tax deductions and exemptions that make owning a home affordable.

How are they threatening homeownership? Last year, Salem politicians attempted to use loopholes in the Oregon Constitution to rob homeowners of their mortgage interest and property tax payment deductions without the required three-fifths supermajority vote.

These loopholes have the potential to make homeownership unattainable for middle-class families.

- The **home mortgage interest tax deduction** saves Oregonians an average of \$2,281 on their state income taxes. Elimination of the deduction could be devastating to over a half-million Oregon households who rely on it to make homeownership more affordable.
- Politicians also targeted the **elimination of the property tax deduction**. Oregon already ranks in the top half of all states for property taxes per capita (www.taxfoundation.org), making homeownership a struggle for many middle-class families and seniors. But eliminating their ability to deduct tax payments on their state taxes could make owning a home nearly impossible.

In a state where housing is becoming increasingly unaffordable, politicians should be focused on making homeownership achievable for current renters. But instead they are busy exploiting loopholes to rob existing homeowners of deductions and exemptions as sacred as those for mortgage interest and property taxes.

That's why the Oregon Association of REALTORS supports Measure 104

For many Oregonians these tax deductions and exemptions are some of the few things that make the dream of owning a home a reality. Using loopholes in the Oregon Constitution to eliminate them could have devastating impacts on middle-class families and the economy.

A YES on Measure 104 is a YES to protecting homeownership

(This information furnished by Carol Russell, Oregonians for Affordable Housing.)

Argument in Favor

OREGON FARMERS, RANCHERS & FORESTERS URGE YOU TO SUPPORT BALLOT MEASURE 104

Twenty years ago, voters passed an amendment to the Oregon Constitution requiring a three-fifths supermajority to raise taxes. But politicians in Salem and their lawyers have created massive loopholes. These loopholes are costing Oregon farmers, ranchers and foresters millions of dollars and making it harder for us to compete in the global marketplace.

Consider just a few examples of how politicians have exploited loopholes to raise revenue:

Earlier this year **the legislature increased taxes on Oregon farmers and other small businesses by over \$196 million.**

-- and they did it without the three-fifths supermajority required by the Oregon Constitution.

Last year the legislature **tried to eliminate important property tax exemptions** for farm and forestry equipment, which help us afford new investments that keep us competitive.

-- and they did it without the three-fifths supermajority required by the Oregon Constitution.

They have also tried to apply a new "Cap and Tax" scheme that would impact Oregon farmers, food processors and mills. **The new "fee" would have cost nearly \$1.4 billion.**

-- and they did it without the three-fifths supermajority required by the Oregon Constitution.

Measure 104 will close the loopholes and protect Oregon jobs in agriculture and forestry.

Oregonians for Food and Shelter

Associated Oregon Loggers

Food Northwest

Please join us in voting YES on 104

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

A MESSAGE FROM THE TAXPAYER ASSOCIATION OF OREGON

MEASURE 104 PROTECTS THE WILL OF OREGON VOTERS

Oregon voters spoke loudly and clearly in 1996 when we amended the Oregon Constitution to require a three-fifths supermajority that raises tax. Even then, Oregonians saw that runaway spending was putting family budgets at risk. So, we voted to require legislators to achieve a three-fifths supermajority in order to raise taxes.

Through a series of backroom deals and legal rulings that defy common-sense politicians have found a way around the will of Oregon voters. That's why we need Measure 104. It closes these loopholes.

Oregon lawmakers just voted for a billion in higher taxes within the past year. Read it for yourself...

1. 10 cent gas tax increase
2. New payroll tax (\$240 million)
3. New car sales Tax (\$130 avg.)
4. Car registration fee hike
5. Car title fee hike
6. New bike tax
7. Truck mileage tax hike (+25%)
8. Tax on Family health insurance (\$330 million)
9. Small business tax (\$376 million)
10. Over 500 fee increases (Hunting, fishing, camping)

Oregonians can't afford more. Oregon now ranks among the top 10 states in the country in terms of individual tax burden (www.TaxFoundation.org). That means that Oregon families are some of the most heavily taxed in the entire country. While Measure 104 won't stop every tax increase it will make it a little harder and ensure that there is broader, bi-partisan support.

MEASURE 104 SENDS A MESSAGE TO POLITICIANS

It tells them that we want better management of our tax dollars. There's currently no political will to make tough decisions. Measure 104 forces politicians to eliminate waste before they come back to us for more money – or find new ways to raise taxes.

PLEASE JOIN THE TAXPAYER ASSOCIATION OF OREGON IN VOTING YES ON MEASURE 104

For news on recent Oregon taxes go to OregonWatchdog.com

(This information furnished by Jason D Williams, Executive Director, Taxpayer Association of Oregon.)

Argument in Favor

Support Measure 104: Keep Energy Prices Low!

Energy prices in Oregon keep going up – just like housing costs. Regardless of the type of fuel being used, **government regulation, taxes, and fees are making it more expensive** for Oregonians to pay their energy bills, heat their homes and fuel their cars and trucks.

In recent years, legislators and their lawyers have found creative loopholes and made several attempts at generating more government revenue by **raising taxes and fees and eliminating exemptions, deductions, and credits without a supermajority vote**.

This past year, politicians successfully targeted smaller businesses with a \$1 billion tax increase on a simple-majority vote, **eliminating tax breaks for hardworking, family-owned businesses that are still available for large businesses.** (SB 1528- 2018)

The same politicians also attempted to raise numerous administrative fees in agency budgets on a simple-majority vote. Making it more expensive and tougher to do business in Oregon, especially in rural communities. Legislative lawyers have even gone as far to take the position that a **new energy tax would not require a three-fifths supermajority vote**, despite raising \$1.4 billion in new state revenue, while increasing energy prices.

Ballot Measure 104 will ensure that any legislation that raises revenue requires a three-fifths supermajority vote. This includes fees or the elimination of tax exemptions, deductions, or credits – sending a message to politicians that we want tax fairness and better management of our tax dollars, not gimmicks and tricks to spend more of our hard earned money.

A **"Yes" vote** will close the loophole and bring more transparency and accountability to state government by making sure that politicians follow the state constitutional requirement to have a three-fifths supermajority on tax increases of any kind.

Join the Oregon Fuels Association and **create more government accountability and stop easy tax hikes by voting Yes on Measure 104.**

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Favor

OREGON HOME BUILDERS URGE YOU TO

VOTE YES ON MEASURE 104

Affordable housing has become a crisis in our state. The cost to build a new home is rising and family incomes are not keeping pace. Add to that our homeless population and we have real challenges to confront.

Measure 104 can be part of the solution.

While we would expect politicians to be doing more to make homeownership affordable, they are doing the opposite. **Last year, legislators attempted to end the ability of many taxpayers to deduct mortgage interest and property tax payments.**

These deductions are some of the few **tools that keep homeownership within reach for many**

lower and middle-income families, and those trying to buy their first home. Without them, our housing crisis could be much, much worse.

- Rural home prices in Oregon are 30% higher than the national average, while rental prices are 16% higher. (*Oregon Office of Economic Analysis, 2018*)
- Oregonians are the 3rdworst in the nation for housing affordability and only 26% of households under the age of 35 live in homes of their own. (*Affordable Oregon, 2018*)
- The average Oregon renter can no longer afford a typical one-bedroom apartment, or a studio in Portland. (*National Low-Income Housing Coalition, 2018*)

Measure 104 will help keep home ownership affordable for more Oregon families by protecting the state home mortgage interest deduction and property tax deduction.

These policies wouldn't just hurt homeowners. Renters would pay more too as landlords need to raise rent to make up for the added cost.

We need to close the loophole that's putting homeowners and those who want to be homeowners at risk. Protect affordable home ownership in Oregon. **We need to vote YES on Measure 104.**

KEEP HOMEOWNERSHIP AFFORDABLE

VOTE YES ON MEASURE 104

(This information furnished by Carol Russell, Oregonians for Affordable Housing.)

Argument in Favor

Southern Oregon Chambers of Commerce

Support Measure 104

Collectively, our local Chambers unite hundreds of businesses and professional firms, to strengthen business and build a better economy in Southern Oregon.

We represent nearly 1,000 members, with over **85% of our membership made up of small businesses**. Our businesses create jobs, employ Oregonians, and contribute to the success of our local and state economy. We believe the use of taxes should be fair and equitable.

That is why we urge a **"YES" vote on Measure 104.**

Today's Problem- Over 20 years ago, Oregonians voted in favor of requiring a three-fifths supermajority vote of the legislature to raise revenue. Recently, politicians created a legal loophole to make it easier to raise taxes by expanding tax bases, increasing fees, and taking away tax deductions with just a simple majority vote, not the constitutionally required three-fifths vote approved by voters.

In 2018, Oregon politicians increased taxes on more than 250,000 businesses, stealing federal tax cuts designed to help create jobs locally and grow the economy. **With a simple majority vote, politicians raised \$1 billion in taxes** at the expense of hardworking Oregonians.

Measure 104 closes the loophole. A “Yes” vote prevents politicians from passing unnecessary tax hikes instead of reigning in spending. Creating bipartisan discussion and solutions, Measure 104 will ensure that politicians efforts to raise revenue is approved by a supermajority vote of the Oregon legislature.

This will create **tax fairness and stability for local businesses.** It will allow us to expand our economic horizons and attract new businesses to our area’s favorable business climate and Southern Oregon’s exceptional quality of life.

Measure 104 simply asks legislators to reach a broader consensus when they want more of your hard-earned tax dollars.

Creating tax fairness isn’t asking for much – Join with us and help end easy tax hikes!

Vote YES on Measure 104

Roseburg Area Chamber of Commerce

Klamath County Chamber of Commerce

(This information furnished by Paul Rainey, Yes on 104.)

Argument in Opposition

DOZENS OF TRUSTED ORGANIZATIONS AGREE:

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 104

Oregon can’t afford the gridlock and waste
Measure 104 would create

Join the following organizations and many more in rejecting unnecessary, risky amendments to Oregon’s constitution.

Below is a partial list of organizations who urge a NO on Measure 104. To see the full list, please visit NoOn104.org/coalition.

**Please join Oregon’s most trusted organizations and
vote No on Measure 104**

For full list visit: NoOn104.org/coalition

- AARP Oregon
- Karl Koenig, President - Oregon State Fire Fighters Council
- Housing Alliance
- OLCV
- Coalition of Communities of Color
- Basic Rights Oregon
- Oregon Education Association
- League of Women Voters
- Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon
- Sierra Club of Oregon
- Nike, Inc.
- Rural Organizing Project
- Family Forward Oregon
- Campaign for Oregon’s Seniors and People with Disabilities
- APANO
- Verde
- Oregon Public Health Institute
- American Federation of Teachers - Oregon
- Causa
- Common Cause
- Climate Solutions
- Fair Shot
- Right 2 Survive
- Oregon Coastal Alliance
- Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste (PCUN)
- Hacienda CDC
- Children First for Oregon
- Portland Tenants United
- Urban League of Portland
- Oregon Wild
- Elders in Action
- Bus Project
- Forward Together
- Health Care for All Oregon
- WaterWatch of Oregon
- Unite Oregon
- SEIU Local 503
- Oregon AFSCME
- Oregon School Employees Association
- American Association of University Women of Oregon
- Sierra Club of Oregon
- National Organization for Women – Oregon Chapter
- Oregon Environmental Council
- Welcome Home Coalition
- Oregon Center for Public Policy (OCPD)
- Oregon AFL-CIO
- Jobs with Justice
- The Vocal Seniority
- Northwest Health Foundation

(This information furnished by Elisabeth Swarttouw, Vote No on Measure 104.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon AFSCME opposes Measures 104

We should only change Oregon's constitution when there is an urgent problem, not on a whim to enrich a small group of special interests at the expense of Oregon families and workers. Unfortunately, that's exactly what Measure 104 would do. That is why Oregon AFSCME, which represents 28,000 workers in the state, is urging a no vote on the Measure 104.

- Measure 104 is unnecessary. Oregon already requires a supermajority to increase taxes, Measure 104 would make it harder to move even basic bills through the legislature.
- The measure would permanently lock special interests loopholes and perks into our Constitution, like tax breaks for heated pools and golf courses.
- Measure 104 will create unprecedented gridlock in Salem, taking routine bills and fees that keep our state moving and turning them into a game of political football. For example, even a licensing fee that ensures nurses are appropriately trained would be politicized under Measure 104.
- Oregon's environment will suffer. Oregon AFSCME's members work in many of the agencies potentially impacted by this measure, and they do everything from keeping our drinking water clean to monitoring our air quality. This work is simply too important to play politics with.

For these reasons and many more, Oregon AFSCME rejects Measure 104 so we can protect the safety of Oregon's communities and the integrity of our political process. Protect Oregon's Constitution and Vote No on Measure 104.

(This information furnished by Joseph E Baessler, Oregon AFSCME.)

Argument in Opposition

Stop Wasteful Tax Breaks — Vote No on Measure 104

Oregon's tax code is riddled with ineffective tax breaks — tax breaks that cost money to administer and reduce revenues needed for critical public services.

Measure 104 will make it harder to amend or eliminate wasteful tax breaks, even in cases of fiscal emergency, recession, or **natural disasters** that require a well-funded response.

Tax breaks, known as tax expenditures, totaled over **\$24 billion** for the 2017-19 biennium, according to an official report prepared by the Oregon Department of Revenue (1). The Tax Expenditure Report lists hundreds of tax breaks, some riddled with loopholes that invite misuse. **Here are some of the frivolous tax breaks that will be monumentally harder to change if Measure 104 passes:**

- Tax credits for pool and hot tub heaters
- A "millionaire" tax break — called a "pass-thru" tax break — that allows most people with over \$500,000 in annual income to significantly cut their taxes.
- The "forest mansion" tax break — that allows multi-million dollar estates that plant trees on their property to get a huge tax break by pretending their mansions are "tree farms."
- "Luxury cigar" tax break — capping taxes for luxury cigars even if they cost hundreds of dollars.
- "Golf course" tax break — gives wealthy landowners a break for owning a golf course.

Measure 104 all but guarantees an Oregon tax system that wastes millions of dollars to benefit the very few. We cannot afford this type of waste.

And because Measure 104 changes the Constitution, many of these wasteful tax breaks and perks will be locked in and almost impossible to change.

Say No to Gridlock and Waste. Vote No on Measure 104

Citation:

(1) <https://www.oregon.gov/DOR/programs/gov-research/Pages/research-tax-expenditure.aspx>

(This information furnished by Thomas K Adamson, Vote No on Measure 104.)

Argument in Opposition

The League of Women Voters of Oregon

Urges Your NO Vote on Measure 104

NO to Cluttering the Constitution – NO to Creating Gridlock

The League of Women Voters is a grassroots, nonpartisan, nonprofit political organization that encourages informed and active participation in government in order to build better communities statewide.

The League believes that the Oregon Constitution should be a framework of state government and not changed without a fundamental reason. The Constitution today provides for a three-fifths supermajority for tax increases. Measure 104 would expand that provision to require that supermajority for every fee increase and any change in tax credits — fees like those assessed to protect our clean air and water, to protect the safety of our food, to provide for funding for the Oregon Health Plan.

The legislature currently approves changes to fees, requiring a majority vote. The League believes that requiring a three-fifths supermajority vote on fees, changes to tax exemptions, deductions and credits would prevent government from functioning in a fair and efficient manner.

Measure 104 is written to amend the constitution, allowing less than a majority of legislators to withhold their support for fees now used to pay for important health and safety issues such as:

- Protecting our air, water, and public lands from polluters
- Programs that inspect and protect our food
- The oversight of doctors, CPAs and other licensed professionals
- Fund health care for many Oregonians

Please vote NO on Measure 104.

Allow government to work efficiently on behalf of Oregonians.

(This information furnished by Norman Turrill, President, League of Women Voters of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

We must be very careful when choosing to amend Oregon's constitution.

That's why AARP strongly opposes Measure 103 and Measure 104.

AARP urges a NO vote on Measures 103 & 104

These ballot measures are completely unnecessary. These measures are a waste of time and money.

- Oregon doesn't have a tax on groceries and no one is proposing one.
- And we already have a supermajority requirement for raising revenue.

This is a risky experiment for Oregon's constitution. Changing the constitution should only be done when there's a real emergency or crisis.

- Measure 103 is unprecedented and untested, so we shouldn't risk our constitution for it. And

- Measure 104 will lead to more legislative gridlock, putting funding for healthcare and other senior services at risk

These measures will create harmful unintended consequences

- Measure 103 would create special-interest carve outs for industry, dramatically reduce state revenues and harm health care funding.
- Measure 104 would make it very difficult to end wasteful tax breaks and spending.

**Please join AARP Oregon and dozens of other trusted groups
Vote NO on Measure 103 and Measure 104**

(This information furnished by Jonathan D Bartholomew, AARP Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

**Elected Leaders Across Oregon Come Together
to Protect Our Constitution**

Vote No on Measure 104

As leaders elected to serve our local communities, we are standing together to protect Oregon's Constitution from special interests by opposing Measure 104.

This risky and unnecessary constitutional amendment would:

- Put funding for healthcare and schools immediately at risk — threatening families in our communities
- Make it harder to cut state government waste — protecting tax breaks like those for heated swimming pools and golf courses
- Increase legislative gridlock in Salem by making nearly every vote a political struggle
- Add new hurdles for local communities that need to respond to emergencies like wildfires and earthquakes with effective emergency funds

Urban, rural, Republican, Democrat or Independent: We all must say no to gridlock and waste. That's why we've come together to oppose this risky and unnecessary constitutional amendment.

Join us in voting NO on Measure 104.

State Senator Lee Beyer
State Senator Elizabeth Steiner Hayward
State Senator Rob Wagner
State Representative Julie Fahey
State Representative Rob Nosse
Multnomah County Chair Deborah Kafoury
Washington County Commissioner Greg Malinowski
Multnomah County Commissioner Sharon Meieran
Washington County Commissioner Dick Schouten
Lane County Commissioner Pete Sorenson
Multnomah County Commissioner Jessica Vega Pederson
Milwaukie Mayor Mark Gamba
Wilsonville Mayor Tim Knapp
Astoria Mayor Arline LaMear
Eugene Mayor Lucy Vinis
Bend City Councilor Barb Campbell
Gearhart City Councilor Paulina Cockrum
Sherwood City Councilor Sean Garland
Lake Oswego City Councilor Theresa Kohlhoff
Bay City City Councilor David McCall
Ashland City Councilor Rich Rosenthal
West Linn City Councilor Richard Sakelik
Happy Valley City Councilor Brett Sherman
Beaverton City Councilor Marc San Soucie
Medford City Councilor Kevin Stine
Lane Community College Board Vice-Chair Matt Keating
and many more...

(This information furnished by Theresa M Kohlhoff, Lake Oswego City Councilor.)

Argument in Opposition

**The Service Employees International Union (SEIU)
Local 503 and Local 49 say NO on 104.**

SEIU represents more than 70,000 healthcare, property services, homecare and public services workers in Oregon. We are members of every community in Oregon, from Portland to Malheur County, and we care about the direction of our state.

Measure 104 is a wasteful, unnecessary change to the constitution that will create harmful gridlock in the state legislature.

Measure 104 changes the rules to protect special interest tax breaks. We believe the interests of regular people need to be protected, not the tax break for golf courses and heated pools, or the tax break politicians get for their meals and gas.

Measure 104 would also create unprecedented gridlock in Salem. Our schools, hospitals, child welfare programs, and police and emergency services suffer when lawmakers can't pass a budget. That means Measure 104 would make it harder for lawmakers to respond in real time when natural disasters like wildfires, earthquakes and storms occur.

This amendment is completely unnecessary. Oregon already requires a supermajority to raise taxes. We don't need to waste time and money amending the Constitution to fix problems that don't exist.

**Vote No on this wasteful,
unnecessary change to the constitution.**

(This information furnished by Elvyss Argueta, SEIU Local 503 OPEU.)

Argument in Opposition

No on Measure 104:

My name is Bill. When I was 17 years old, I voluntarily enlisted in the United States Marine Corps. I was soon shipped overseas to serve in the infantry through the remainder of the Korean War.

Upon returning from the horrors of combat, veteran services provided the foundation that helped me build a family and earn a living. Now, I'm 83 and happily retired with 12 great grandchildren following a 25-year legal career.

But I worry about the future for our veterans. They've made incredible sacrifices for this great country, yet have already seen funding for essential services cut. Measure 104 is another threat to those services.

So join veterans across Oregon. Vote No on 104.

Dark money groups like Priority Oregon have financially supported Measure 104 because it provides special deals for special interests, such as locking in tax breaks for golf courses and swimming pools.

But Measure 104 would put veterans services at risk by creating political gridlock and making it impossible for politicians to get anything done. It would lead to cuts in services that help veterans get and education or access healthcare.

If Measure 104 was instituted before 2018, Oregon could have faced \$1 billion in cuts to veteran services, public schools and mental health services. Veterans and their families would have been among the hundreds of thousands of Oregonians who would have lost their healthcare.

There are tens of thousands of veterans living in Oregon who aren't recognized by the US Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and need help accessing health care, housing, and transportation services. Those veterans who can access the VA still rely on Medicaid to fill the gap to meet their health care needs.

We served our country with pride. Don't let dark money groups interfere with the services we earned. Measure 104 is pointless, risky and just plain wrong. Please vote No.

Bill Habel
Portland
Veteran of the United States Marine Corps

(This information furnished by Jake Foster, Vote No on Measure 104.)

Argument in Opposition

**Oregon Workers
Strongly Oppose Constitutional Amendment 104**

Constitutional Amendment 104 does not benefit working people in Oregon and should be opposed by voters. Amending Oregon's Constitution should only be done when there is an urgent, major program and Amendment 104 does not meet that criteria. This measure would bring significant risk to workers and would endanger the way our state makes laws that benefit working families.

Constitutional Amendment 104 will make it harder for our legislature to make the kind of progress Oregon's workers need to prosper. It is unnecessary, as our constitution already requires a supermajority to raise taxes. What it actually does is jeopardize our schools and healthcare while putting tax loopholes for special interests into our constitution. This wasteful and potentially harmful amendment brings Washington DC-style political gridlock to Oregon and should be opposed.

**Oregon's voters who are concerned
about the livelihood of working people should
vote no on Constitutional Amendment 104.**

(This information furnished by Tom Chamberlain, Oregon AFL-CIO.)

Argument in Opposition

**Oregon's conservation and outdoor recreation groups
urge a NO on 104**

Our organizations represent Oregonians in every corner of the state committed to protecting our state's rivers, forests, beaches and lands.

We always urge caution when voters consider changing our state's constitution, especially when those amendments impact Oregon's outdoors. We took a close look at Measure 104, and what we found raises real concerns.

Measure 104 makes responding to emergencies and natural disasters like earthquakes and wildfires that threaten nearby communities much more difficult. Special interests could more easily stop legislative actions urgently needed to address major disasters in real time.

Measure 104 creates political gridlock by giving bureaucrats and lobbyists in Salem the power to use conservation fees as a bargaining chip. At a time when politics is increasingly dividing our country, the last thing we need is for Measure 104 to politicize something virtually all of us agree on: the importance of protecting access to the outdoors for recreation and conservation.

Measure 104 jeopardizes our natural resources and environment that hunters, anglers and rural communities depend on. Since 104 makes it harder to adjust conservation fees, fisheries, forests and public lands in our state could lose critical funding for jobs and improvements that fuel tourism and local economies.

Environmental advocates agree: vote NO on Measure 104 to protect Oregon's environment from political games and gridlock.

**Climate Solutions
Friends of the Columbia Gorge**

**Oregon Coast Alliance
Oregon Environmental Council
Oregon League of Conservation Voters
Oregon Wild
Sierra Club of Oregon
Verde
WaterWatch of Oregon**

(This information furnished by Lindsey Scholten, Oregon League of Conservation Voters.)

Argument in Opposition

**Protect our Constitution:
Vote No on Measures 104, 103, and 106**

- *** We should only amend the constitution when there's an urgent reason ***
- *** Constitutional amendments lock in flaws — and cannot be fixed ***
- *** Measures 103, 104, and 106 create special interest loopholes ***
- *** No other state has constitutional amendments like these ***

Measures 104, 103 and 106 erode protections, creating flaws and loopholes for special interests that will be nearly impossible to change.

These amendments are costly, flawed and pointless, but we can protect Oregon by voting No.

Measure 104 adds a new layer of bureaucracy and gridlock:

- It protects special interest tax breaks, but making it harder to help Oregon families.
- It's pointless for us, but it helps a narrow few: the Constitution already requires a supermajority threshold for new taxes on Oregonians.
- Designed to protect oil and gas interests. This measure protects specific loopholes for specific industries.

Measure 103 is a broad and sweeping constitutional change:

- It's retroactive, which means it rolls back existing services for Oregonians including healthcare for families. This cannot be changed.
- It's flawed and sloppy. Banning taxes on certain items in a nonsensical way that its own authors do not understand the impact. If it passes, expect years of litigation.
- It only helps special interests, creating winners and losers in Oregon's tax laws based on who can afford a high-powered lobbyist.

Measure 106 puts cuts to healthcare into Oregon's constitution:

- It cuts access to healthcare for low-income Oregonians and public employees.
- Sets a dangerous precedent of constitutionally cherry picking which medical procedures will and won't be covered. That has never been done before in Oregon's constitution.
- Takes away needed healthcare coverage from teachers, firefighters, and tens of thousands more.

Poorly drafted Constitutional Amendments like Measures 104, 103 and 106 are nearly impossible to change. Their flaws will be locked into our constitution.

Vote No on Measures 104, 103 and 106

(This information furnished by Elisabeth Swarttouw, No on Measure 104: Because the Constitution should only be amended when absolutely necessary.)

Argument in Opposition

DOZENS OF TRUSTED ORGANIZATIONS AGREE:

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 104

Oregon can't afford the gridlock and waste Measure 104 would create

Measure 104 would add a useless, wasteful amendment to our constitution that would create DC-style gridlock in Oregon, jeopardizing the schools and healthcare that families count on. Organizations from **every part of the political spectrum** are urging Oregonians to **oppose** Measure 104 to protect our Constitution from tricks by political insiders.

This amendment is completely unnecessary. Oregon already requires a three-fifths majority to raise taxes. Measure 104 would expand that requirement beyond taxes to forever lock loopholes and perks into Oregon's constitution.

Even worse, this amendment would create unprecedented gridlock in Salem, potentially blocking billions in funding for schools and healthcare.

Please join Oregon's most trusted organizations and vote No on Measure 104

For full list visit: NoOn104.org/coalition

AARP Oregon
 Family Forward Oregon
 Housing Alliance
 OLCV
 Oregon Education Association
 Coalition of Communities of Color
 Basic Rights Oregon
 Unite Oregon
 American Federation of Teachers - Oregon
 Community Alliance of Tenants
 Causa
 Common Cause
 Bus Project
 Fair Shot
 Karl Koenig, President - Oregon State Fire Fighters Council
 Right 2 Survive
 Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste (PCUN)
 Urban League of Portland
 Campaign for Oregon's Seniors and People with Disabilities
 APANO
 Verde
 Oregon Public Health Institute
 Hacienda CDC
 Children First for Oregon
 Welcome Home Coalition
 Elders in Action
 Forward Together
 Health Care for All Oregon
 Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon
 American Association of University Women of Oregon
 Sierra Club of Oregon
 Rural Organizing Project
 National Organization for Women - Oregon Chapter
 Oregon Environmental Council
 Oregon Center for Public Policy (OCPP)
 Oregon AFL-CIO
 Jobs with Justice
 League of Women Voters Oregon
 SEIU Local 503
 Oregon AFSCME
 Oregon School Employees Association

(This information furnished by Elisabeth Swarttouw, No on Measure 104: Say No to Gridlock and Waste.)

Argument in Opposition

As a social studies teacher at Roberts High School in Salem, I teach students about Oregon's history and government. History shows us that time and again, flaws in our constitution hurt Oregon families and are extraordinarily difficult to change.

This year, Oregon voters are being asked to amend our state constitution with Measures 104 and 103. The initiative process was created to give citizens a voice, but these two measures were placed on the ballot by special interests spending millions to advance amendments that give themselves new, large tax loopholes — and make it harder to close existing loopholes.

This is not the way our Constitution should be amended.

We should only amend our constitution when there is a clear and urgent need. Mistakes in the constitution take decades to correct.

When I teach my students about American or Oregon history, we discuss how seemingly simple laws or amendments can have far-reaching effects and unintended consequences. There are many examples of this throughout history, and even some examples from Oregon. Oregon voters, like my students, know that we should read proposed law changes very carefully before accepting them. Things are rarely as simple as they seem at first glance.

This is especially true when a small group of special interests are spending millions to put something on the ballot.

The constitution should include clear, straightforward language that's easy to understand. It shouldn't take a law degree to figure out what it means.

While Measures 104 and 103 may seem simple enough, there is actually quite a lot of room for interpretation. For example, the definition of "groceries" in Measure 103 is far from what you find in the dictionary. It has numerous exceptions, and it's even retroactive to September 2017!

Read carefully, do your research, and consider the unintended consequences. I have, and that's why I'm voting no on Measures 104 and 103.

Caryn Connolly
 Social Studies Teacher
 Salem, Oregon

(This information furnished by Trent A Lutz, Oregon Education Association.)

Argument in Opposition

OREGON SIERRA CLUB URGES A NO ON MEASURE 104

DON'T CHANGE OUR CONSTITUTION

DON'T JEOPARDIZE OREGON'S WILDLIFE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

We unfortunately still live in a world where too many dismiss or minimize the effects of climate change. If Measure 104 were to pass, it would give climate change-denying politicians leverage to weaken standards Oregon has set to combat the most consequential crisis of our lifetimes.

Measure 104 changes our constitution, creating massive gridlock and locking waste into our state budget. It's completely unnecessary, turning every reasonable and vital fee into a gridlock-causing nightmare, making it monumentally more difficult to protect our environment and Oregon's natural resources.

- Environmental quality fees for pollution permits would be capped, making it harder to identify and stop illegal pollution in our air and water.

- Park fees ensure upkeep of our public lands, from the tall firs in our expansive forests to the ponderosa pines spread throughout the high desert.
- The Department of Environmental Quality collects fees from polluters that generate hazardous waste in order to ensure they are complying with environmental standards.

These are just a few examples of the commonsense policies that help keep Oregon a beautiful place to live, play and work. If special interests who care more about profits than sustainability get their way and amend Oregon's Constitution, these reasonable and essential fees will be politicized by legislators. The last thing Oregonians need is more gridlock.

The choice is clear. Join the Oregon Sierra Club and Vote No on Measure 104.

(This information furnished by Rhett Lawrence, Conservation Director, Oregon Sierra Club.)

Argument in Opposition

We are members of The Common Good Fund, a fund with a mission to advance the common good in Oregon.

We generally oppose creating or amending state tax policy through ballot measures – especially those that alter the Oregon Constitution.

Together we represent many home-grown businesses, and we love Oregon. **Oregonians should guard against major policy mistakes that could undermine the building blocks of what makes Oregon special.**

For those reasons and others, we urge voters to say 'No' to Measures 104 & 103.

--

"The two measures would become constitutional amendments, meaning every word of both would be inserted into the Oregon Constitution. Errors in the drafting of ballot measures are expensive to correct. Oregon's tax code should be modernized to treat individuals and businesses fairly, deliver stability during economic downturns and fund essential public services, including our public schools, parks, libraries and public safety. Constitutional Amendments 104 and 103 are not the way to do it."

Julia Brim-Edwards, Nike, Inc.

--

"As a growing, new, Oregon-based company, we urge voters to reject Measures 103 and 104. Oregon must remain a place which fosters a vibrant tech industry with well-paying jobs.

That means greater investments in public schools and a thoughtful, stable tax policy for businesses like ours. Flawed, poorly written measures like 104 and 103 are not the answer."

Mat Ellis, Cloudability

--

"As a business owner I am deeply troubled by Measures 104 and 103. Even small changes in law impact our ability to stay afloat. These measures would stifle Oregon's economy rather than grow it.

In our business, we know how important it is for Oregonians to have access to stable, affordable housing. Measures 103 and 104 will make the housing crisis in Oregon worse by making it harder to fund housing adequately."

John Russell, Russell Development Company

--

Join us & other Oregon businesses in voting NO on 104 & 103.

Full list of businesses and others at www.NoOn104.org/coalition

(This information furnished by John W Russell, Common Good Fund.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Fire Fighters: Measure 104 would cause unprecedented gridlock in Salem

My name is Karl Koenig, and I'm a fire fighter in Clackamas County. One thing I know all too well is that when politicians play politics with routine bills for no good reason, it's Oregonians and the services we rely on — like healthcare, schools, and public safety — that suffer. That's why I'm so troubled by Measure 104, which would lead to unprecedented gridlock in Salem.

When we elect legislators, we trust that they will represent our values and get things done for our communities. But Measure 104 threatens that: Funded by special interests that want to protect their perks and loopholes, Measure 104 would permanently change our constitution to make it harder to accomplish anything in Salem — even something as routine as passing park fees, or as important as reining in runaway tax breaks.

Oregon already requires a supermajority to pass new taxes, making Measure 104 not only obstructive, but also unnecessary. It would tie up school funding and make it nearly impossible for the legislature to respond to crises like wildfires and natural disasters.

Recently, we've seen the tragedy that unfolds when wildfires spread. It's an all-hands-on-deck emergency, and we need to be sure communities have the resources to protect our homes, our businesses, and our unique natural areas when disaster strikes. But Measure 104 would make it nearly impossible to respond quickly when wildfires grow out of control.

Fire fighters across the state agree:

- **Measure 104 would make it nearly impossible to fund schools and services.**
- **When natural disaster strikes — like a wildfire — the legislature would struggle to respond in real time if Measure 104 passes.**
- **Measure 104 would lead to political gridlock never seen before in Oregon.**

Join fire fighters across the state in voting No on Measure 104 so we can keep Oregon safe and healthy.

Karl Koenig, President Oregon State Fire Fighters Council

(This information furnished by Elisabeth Swarttouw, on behalf of the Oregon State Fire Fighters Council.)

Argument in Opposition

I'm a nurse, and I'm voting NO on Measure 104

Measure 104 would create gridlock and make it harder to protect healthcare for vulnerable Oregonians

My name is Diane Hedrick, and I've worked as a nurse in Eastern Oregon for over 30 years. As nurses, our job is to look out for the best interest of patients, which is why I'm strongly opposed to Measure 104 — which would make it much harder for nurses and healthcare providers like me to do our jobs.

Here's why: Measure 104 is funded by special interests for special interests to protect their perks and loopholes.

Oregon *already* requires a supermajority in the Oregon legislature to pass any increase in taxes. What Measure 104 really does is change Oregon's constitution to make it much more difficult to pass even routine bills, and nearly impossible to cut wasteful tax breaks and special interest loopholes. We need to get more work done in Salem, not less.

Measure 104 will lead to more political gridlock, threatening funding for healthcare and other family services.

It would make basic State Board of Nursing fee adjustments a high-stakes game of political football, jeopardizing their budget.

What's more, if this measure had been in place earlier this year, it would have been nearly impossible for legislators to rein in runaway tax breaks and fully fund our healthcare, schools, and other family services. The last thing that families and vulnerable Oregonians need is more uncertainty about whether they will be able to keep their healthcare, or whether their child's school will have to cut more teachers.

The bottom line: Measure 104 changes our constitution to protect special interests, not Oregon families.**Measure 104 will cause unprecedented gridlock, and could leave Oregon families without healthcare and facing larger class sizes. I urge you to join me and the Oregon Nurses Association in voting NO on MEASURE 104.**

(This information furnished by Christopher Rayborn, Oregon Nurses Association.)

Argument in Opposition**Oregon educators say no on Measures 104 and 103**

There are two constitutional amendments on the ballot in November that are risky, unnecessary, and will hurt Oregon kids.

Oregon's students cannot afford Measures 104 and 103. These two Constitutional Amendments were put forth by special interests to protect Oregon's low corporate tax rate. Here's what Measures 104 and 103 would do:

- Measures 104 and 103 block new funding for K-12 education and protect massive tax breaks.
- Measures 104 and 103 undermine efforts to expand technical and vocational training.
- Measures 104 and 103 limit our state's ability to improve the quality of our schools.
- Measures 104 and 103 keep Oregon's classroom sizes at some of the highest in the nation.

Our neighborhood and community schools would suffer under Measures 104 and 103.

Measures 104 and 103 are backed by special interests to protect special interests and corporate profits.

In history classes, we teach that constitutional amendments are supposed to reflect Oregon's fundamental values. Oregonians value public education, not special immunity for corporate interests.

**Protect school funding
Protect our kids, not special interests
Vote NO on Measures 104 and 103**

(This information furnished by Trent A Lutz, Oregon Education Association.)

Argument in Opposition**We Urge Caution When Amending Oregon's Constitution.**

As professors and practitioners of constitutional law and/or economics, we study Oregon's Constitution and how it protects the rights of Oregonians. **Constitutional amendments lock in real, lasting consequences that cannot be easily undone.**

The history of Oregon's Constitution shows many examples of flawed amendments written by special interests. Those flaws are incredibly difficult to fix once enacted; it can take decades to fix even the smallest problem.

Measures 104 and 103 were written by lobbyists — not accountants, economists, or constitutional experts — and the mistakes in the text are daunting. It's unclear what these measures would actually do. Experts disagree about their impact and scope. Lawsuits will determine the final effect, but once the Supreme Court finally sorts out the vague text, changes cannot be made without another statewide ballot measure.

The flaws in these measures are unacceptable, especially because these measures do not actually address urgent problems. Measure 103 bans a tax that doesn't exist. Measure 104 takes Oregon's supermajority requirement that protects taxpayers and expands it to protect special interests. This doesn't meet the threshold for an urgent need.

Simply put, slick campaign slogans do not translate into sound public policy.

Measures 104 and 103 would create new loopholes and make it monumentally more difficult to eliminate existing ones. By carving new exemptions in stone, well-funded special interests with the resources to take advantage of new loopholes will do so — while other taxpayers foot the bill. This is not fair, and will lead to years of problems down the road.

We hope Oregonians will consider their vote carefully before putting messy and risky new amendments into our Constitution.**Please join us in voting NO on Measures 104 & 103.**

Margaret Hallock, Professor Emeritus, University of Oregon

Paul Diller, Professor of Law, Willamette University

Margaret Olney, JD

Aruna Masih, JD

Institutional affiliations listed for identification purposes only and do not represent endorsements by the institutions.

(This information furnished by Jake Foster, Vote No on 103: Protect Oregon's Constitution.)

Argument in Opposition**Las organizaciones Latinxs en Oregon proponen que digas
NO en las medidas 104 y 103**

Causa

PCUN

Verde

Las medidas 104 y 103 perjudican a nuestras comunidades en vez de ayudar a crear las escuelas, cuidado de salud, casas y trabajos que merecemos, estas medidas amenazan a la democracia creando más confusión.

Las medidas 104 y 103 son:

Innecesarias - Porque desperdician tiempo y dinero resolviendo problemas que no existen.

Engañosas - No creas nada de lo que dicen, estas medidas no hacen nada para ayudar a nuestras familias.

Malgastadoras - Hace que sea mucho más difícil reducir el gasto público y centrarse en los servicios que realmente importan.

Defectuosas - Las medidas tienen tantos errores que llevarían décadas arreglarlos.

Permanentes - Estaría en la constitución de Oregon, así que quedaríamos atados con esas medidas.

¡Apoya a la comunidad y vota NO en las medidas 104 y 103!

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Causa Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 104

**"We wouldn't run our businesses this way.
Why would we run our state this way?"**

As a small business, you need to be flexible to survive. You need to make the right decisions and have the ability to act on them. Running a state government is no different.

But Measure 104 would permanently change Oregon's legislative process in a way that would lead to gridlock, making it almost impossible for Oregon's leaders to do what it takes to make our state, our communities and our economy thrive.

By increasing anti-democratic supermajority requirements to pass legislation, 104 would make it next to impossible to have the legislature conduct business. And it specifically throws a monkey wrench into funding for boards, commissions and programs that are essential for businesses and industries that are important parts of Oregon's economy. It has nothing to do with the taxes you pay. But it could cripple our ability to do business.

Oregon already has more partisanship and legislative gridlock than we can stand. Measure 104 will make it infinitely worse.

PLEASE VOTE NO ON 104!

Learn more: www.104BadForBusiness.com

Anne Eldridge, Antonio's Farm, Talent

Anthony Effinger, Banter Partners, Portland

Carys Wilkins, Mahonia Gardens, Sisters

Christine Perala Gardiner PhD, Siskiyou Alpaca, Cave Junction

Eli Spevak, Orange Splot LLC, Portland

Elly Blue, Microcosm Publishing, Portland

George Luz, Luz Social and Environmental Associates, Ashland

Gordon Feighner, Jam on Hawthorne, Portland

Jim Houser, Hawthorne Auto Clinic, Portland

Josh Hinerfeld, Cambium Strategy, Portland

K.A Hughes, Co-owner, Blue Scorcher Bakery/Cafe, Astoria

Lamia Attar, La Bouffe International Gourmet, Portland

Laurent Albouze, Prospect Bottle Shop, Portland

Mark Rainey, Cascade Record Pressing, Milwaukie

Mark Vanderzanden, Surround Architecture Inc, Portland

Nancy Montgomery, Columbia River Coffee Roaster, Astoria

Richard Goche, Sacred Sea Tuna, Coquille

Roger Fadness, Ohana Salsa Co, Bend

Sean Nikas, Busy Bees Real Estate, Salem

Terry Rusinow, Everett Street Guesthouse, Portland

Tom Beans, Dudley's Bookshop Cafe, Bend

(This information furnished by Dana T Freedensfeld, Vote No on 104: 104 is Bad for Business.)

Argument in Opposition

**Join Affordable Housing Advocates
Vote No on Measure 104**

Housing Alliance

Hacienda CDC

Community Alliance of Tenants

Housing Oregon

Portland Tenants United

Right 2 Survive

Welcome Home Coalition

It's clear: Oregon is in the middle of an affordable housing crisis. We are all feeling it. Working families can no longer afford their rents. Seniors, veterans, and people with disabilities are forced to choose between paying rent and putting food on the table.

The housing crisis is an emergency.

Measure 104 makes it harder to respond to emergencies.

Measure 104 would increase gridlock - making it nearly impossible to get anything done in Salem.

The legislature needs to be able to respond immediately in times of trouble — whether it's funding emergency housing, tackling life-threatening wildfires or addressing the impact of a natural disaster or financial crisis.

Measure 104 would result in more, DC-style partisan politics that don't address our housing crisis.

It's hard enough for politicians to come together to address the challenges that are facing Oregonians. **We can't afford to make a bad situation worse.**

Measure 104 would make things worse.

Addressing our housing crisis is long overdue. It's an urgent problem that we need to address today. We know that individuals and families looking for housing face many barriers - from the cost of a down payment, or a deposit for a new apartment, or huge rent increases, to a serious lack of tenant protections and not enough safe, quality and affordable homes.

Measure 104 would add more barriers for affordable housing.

As affordable housing advocates, we've been working to bring together business, community members and elected officials to find solutions. But special interest lobbyists pushing their own agendas often get in the way. Measure 104 is a prime example of special interests favoring their bottom line before the needs of working families.

Join us in the fight for more affordable housing and against special interests.

Join us in Voting No on Measure 104.

(This information furnished by Alison McIntosh, Oregon Housing Alliance.)

Argument in Opposition

Join the **American Federation of Teachers - Oregon**. Vote **NO** on troubling, risky changes to Oregon's constitution.

Vote No on Measure 104.

AFT-Oregon represents 13,000 Oregon workers in K-12, community college and higher education in faculty and classified positions; and childcare workers, in both public and private sectors. AFT-Oregon advocates for quality education and healthcare for all Oregonians, and gives working educators a voice in the issues that matter most to our jobs, our families, and the students we serve.

The non-partisan AFT-Oregon Political and Legislative Affairs Committee spent several weeks studying this measure, listening to arguments and analysis, and assessing the potential impacts on our members.

As a result, **we are warning against Measure 104.**

Measure 104 is a risky constitutional amendment. There is already a supermajority requirement for tax increases in Oregon, but 104 extends that requirement to some of the most routine votes in Salem like simple fee changes. This amendment would jeopardize funding for education, health care, affordable housing and other vital services.

Our constitution should only be changed when there is a clear and urgent problem. **We should not change Oregon's constitution at the whim of special interests and big corporations who want to hamstring state and local government for their own benefit.**

Measure 104 is not only unnecessary, it will also lead to massive gridlock in Salem. With all the chaos in Washington D.C., Oregon should be doing more than ever to support students and vulnerable families, not changing the constitution to lock in runaway tax loopholes for wealthy special interests.

Join educators and families across Oregon and vote NO on Measure 104!

Visit www.teachersagainst104.com to learn more.

(This information furnished by Marcus Swift, American Federation of Teachers - Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon PTA Says NO to Measures 104 & 103

Oregon PTA's mission is to engage and empower families and communities to advocate for public policy that helps every child realize their potential. As an organization, one of our core charges is to advocate for adequately funding schools with stable revenue streams.

As active parents and members of Oregon PTA, we know that Measure 104 and Measure 103 do nothing to help fund schools, and it will actually make it even more difficult to give our kids the resources they need to succeed. By giving away new tax loopholes to special interests, making it harder to eliminate existing tax loopholes, and opening the door to even more gridlock in Salem, Measures 104 and 103 will seriously hinder our ability to fully fund K-12 education in Oregon.

These constitutional amendments are risky and will have far-reaching consequences. It is our duty as voters (and as parents) to be thoughtful and deliberate — and only amend it when absolutely necessary. Measures 104 and 103 are not solving urgent problems. They aren't written for families like ours, they were only written to benefit the few.

Vote NO to send a strong message to special interests that we don't want to play games with our constitution. We want action to fund education and the programs that students in our state need to succeed. Too many students arrive at school each morning hungry and don't have a stable place to go home to after class. As members of our school communities, we need to look after each other - not special interests' bottom lines.

Join parents from around Oregon and the Oregon PTA in opposing 104 & 103.

Sharon Meigh-Chang, Portland	Diane McCalmont, Florence	Kristi Dille, Clackamas
Collin Robinson, Bend	Jeff Hanes, Salem	Scott Overton, Portland
Roger Kirchner, Portland	Lisa Kersel, Portland	Kevin McHargue, Portland
Erica Hailstone, Portland	L. Otto Schell, Portland	

(This information furnished by Lawrence O Schell, Oregon PTA.)

Argument in Opposition

Vote NO on Ballot Measure 104

Tax Fairness Oregon (TFO) is a non-partisan volunteer organization promoting tax fairness and equity. We follow the money and advocate to policy-makers. Our goals are a fair and balanced tax system that provides sufficient revenues for basic services, including high quality education and health care.

We have evaluated Measure 104 and STRONGLY urge opposition for four fundamental reasons:

1) It creates a tyranny of the minority because 2/5ths of the legislature could control the budget rather than the elected majority. A minority would be able to take control of most revenue, fee, tax break, tax credit, and even program eligibility decisions. This undermines the most basic principles of our democracy: One Person = One Vote.

2) It protects large corporations and the wealthy by effectively locking in current tax breaks and credits that disproportionately benefit special interests.

3) It is so broadly and poorly written it will damage the normal functioning of state government, leading to unprecedented gridlock and dysfunction. Fees and taxes must be flexible to respond to changing needs and economic conditions.

4) Tax policy should not be in the Constitution because that makes it difficult and costly to revise or eliminate, requiring a vote of the people to make even small changes. Tax policy must be flexible, set by the legislature, not fixed in stone.

JOIN TAX FAIRNESS OREGON IN VOTING NO ON MEASURE 104!

(This information furnished by Jody Wiser, Executive Director, Tax Fairness Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

Common Cause Oregon Opposes Measure 104

Say No to Undermining Democracy, Perks for Special Interests & the Wealthy

Common Cause Oregon is a nonpartisan public interest group that champions democracy reform by empowering **people** to have an organized voice in the political process. Oregonians working together, we serve as a force for open, honest, accountable government at the local, state and national levels.

We believe that all Oregonians share an interest in a self-governing democracy that is efficient and accountable to us, the people. **But Measure 104 would amend the constitution in ways that undermine democracy and the greater good.**

Undermining democracy.

Measure 104 would create a straight jacket, unnecessarily limiting the legislature's ability to respond nimbly to ever-changing conditions. The framers of our democracy reserved supermajority requirements for special cases, like overriding a presidential veto. This measure is overly restrictive.

Undermining our economy.

Measure 104 would severely limit lawmakers' ability to create and maintain the infrastructure that drives economic success for all. By limiting Oregon's budget and tax options, it would hamstring lawmakers from acting on opportunities to invest in the state, allocate funds to areas of greatest need, or to areas with the greatest potential return on investment.

By and for special interests.

Monied special interests have spent more than \$1 million on Measure 104 (1) They do so because it helps their bottom line. If we let them pass this, it will make it harder to get rid of tax breaks and perks for the few and to defend the economic interests of everyday Oregonians.

Our government should be open, honest and accountable. Measure 104 takes us the opposite direction, with government by and for monied special interests.

Join Common Cause Oregon in voting NO on Measure 104.

(1) Oregon Secretary of State, ORESTAR, <https://secure.sos.state.or.us/orestar/gotoPublicTransactionSearch.do>

(This information furnished by Kate E Titus, Common Cause.)

Argument in Opposition**Who is behind Measure 104? Special interests.**

Before you vote on Measure 104, it's important to know exactly who is behind it: Measure 104 is **written by special interests, for special interests**. When you look at the list, it's no wonder these groups want to cause gridlock in Salem, all so they can keep their perks.

The special interests below have all contributed or in-kind money to the Measure 104 campaign (1):

- **Priority Oregon** - A shadowy, far-right special interest group that has refused to disclose its donors and board members.
- **Koch Brothers-funded national business group**
- **Taxpayers Association of Oregon** - A group long associated with Loren Parks, the reclusive Nevada multimillionaire and sex hypnotist.
- **Realtors + Home Builders PACs** - Protecting perks for wealthy property owners, not everyday Oregonians who need more affordable housing.
- **Byrnes Oil Company**
- **Oregon Restaurant and Lodging Association** - Has spent years opposing paid sick leave and an increased minimum wage

And that's not all — special interests have poured millions into this campaign. They want to keep their special interest loopholes and make it harder to get rid of wasteful tax loopholes that they exploit.

(1) Oregon Secretary of State, ORESTAR, <https://secure.sos.state.or.us/orestar/gotoPublicTransactionSearch.do>

(This information furnished by Thomas K Adamson, Vote No on Measure 104.)

Argument in Opposition**Oregon League of Conservation Voters Opposes Measure 104**

Measure 104 is an unnecessary change to Oregon's constitution that would have permanent, negative consequences for Oregon's environment.

The Oregon League of Conservation Voters' mission is to support pro-environment initiatives that reduce pollution, protect wildlands and wildlife, create healthy and vibrant communities, and prevent climate change. Oregonians value environmental protection and our state's beauty, and many communities in our state rely on tourism revenue to fund local services. **Defeating this measure is vital to protect the progress we've made — and to continue advancing conservation efforts in every corner of our state.**

Measure 104 means more wasteful tax loopholes.

At a time when many natural resource and environmental protection agencies are underfunded, we cannot afford wasteful giveaways to special interests and corporate polluters who do not prioritize Oregon's environmental health.

Measure 104 means more gridlock.

Stewardship of our forests, farmland, rivers, and streams requires legislative action. By politicizing routine budget bills, a minority of legislators will be able to jeopardize the funding that protects our air and water.

Measure 104 means slower responses to natural disasters, like wildfires and earthquakes.

The health of nearly every Oregonian has been impacted by fires over the last several summers. Our state agencies need to be able to respond to natural disasters by freeing up emergency response funds. Measure 104's gridlock makes it harder to send resources where they are needed most in the case of fires, earthquakes or floods.

Measure 104 would slow progress on reversing the effects of climate change.

OLCV champions policies that reduce climate pollution using the best available science. We support investments in clean energy technologies, public transit, and energy efficient homes and businesses. Measure 104 would make progress on fighting climate change at the state level almost impossible.

For these reasons, we oppose this unnecessary and risky constitutional amendment.

Join The Oregon League of Conservation Voters And VOTE NO on 104

(This information furnished by Lindsey Scholten, Oregon League of Conservation Voters.)

Argument in Opposition**Don't change the constitution: Vote NO on 104, 103 and 106**

As a former Oregon Supreme Court Justice and a judge for over 40 years, I relied on our state constitution to protect your rights.

Now, Measures 104, 103 and 106 want to make pointless, risky and misleading changes to our state constitution. We should not change the constitution unless there is an urgent, major reason to do so.

104 Locks in wasteful perks for special interests into our constitution and will create DC-style gridlock in Salem. 104 is an unnecessary expansion of Oregon's supermajority requirement that would extend far beyond protections for taxpayers: it will lead to legislative gridlock, likely forcing cuts on services like K-12 schools and Medicaid.

Measures 103 and 106 are equally dangerous:

103 there is no amendment like Measure 103 in any state in the country. Measure 103 locks a series of complicated changes into our constitution. The authors of the bill, lobbyists that work in Salem, cannot agree on the impact of the measure. The Attorney General and the Oregon Supreme Court found a number of impacts of Measure 103 that the authors didn't intend, including provisions that make it impossible to lower taxes for food-related businesses, and rollbacks to healthcare funding for Oregon families.

106 would permanently amend the Oregon constitution and set a dangerous precedent by allowing special interests to decide which medical procedures insurance can or can't cover, permanently restricting access to reproductive healthcare for hundreds of thousands of vulnerable Oregonians

As a judge, I can tell you that these changes to our constitution are pointless, risky, misleading and wrong.

Oregon's Constitution should not be a testing ground for special interest experimentation.

Join me in rejecting dangerous constitutional amendments.
Vote No on 103, 104 and 106.

(This information furnished by Elisabeth Swarttouw, on behalf of Retired Supreme Court Judge Bill Riggs.)

Argument in Opposition

Join Community of Color Led Organizations: Vote No on 104

Our organizations work on policies to advance racial equity, protect people from being forced out of their homes and neighborhoods, promote economic justice, close the opportunity gap, and support and strengthen families.

We work to address economic disparity, institutional racism and inequity of services experienced by our families, children, and communities.

We are urging a No Vote on 104 because the measure is **deeply flawed and completely unnecessary.**

Oregon already has a supermajority requirement to raise taxes. **We shouldn't be wasting time and money to amend the constitution for no reason.** That time and money could be better invested in addressing disparities in health care and education for Oregon children and families.

Measure 104 puts funding for essential services at risk.

If this harmful amendment had been in place earlier this year, Oregon would have faced \$1 billion in cuts to public schools, health and mental health care, and housing and transportation services, disproportionately impacting communities of color.

But Measure 104 would amend our constitution to make it harder to do our work and create more barriers than ever to shape policies and investments that benefit Oregon children and families.

An expansion of the supermajority requirement would calcify the ways socioeconomic disparity and oppression are institutionalized in our tax code, and further advantage wealthy special interest groups over Oregon families, children, and low income and communities of color.

Vote No on Measure 104.

Coalition of Communities of Color
 Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon
 Causa
 Hacienda CDC
 Forward Together
 NAACP Portland Chapter
 OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon
 Pineros Campesinos del Noroeste (PCUN)
 Unite Oregon
 Verde

(This information furnished by Jenny Lee, Coalition of Communities of Color.)

vote!



Ballots must be received by 8 pm on November 6

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



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 8683

se habla español

TTY 1 800 735 2900

for the hearing impaired

Proposed by initiative petition to be voted on at the General Election, November 6, 2018.

Measure No.

105

Repeals law limiting use of state/local law enforcement resources to enforce federal immigration laws

Estimate of Financial Impact	100
Text of Measure	101
Explanatory Statement	101
Arguments in Favor	102
Arguments in Opposition	104

Ballot Title Caption

Repeals law limiting use of state/local law enforcement resources to enforce federal immigration laws

Result of "Yes" Vote

"Yes" vote repeals law limiting (with exceptions) use of state/local law enforcement resources for detecting/apprehending persons suspected only of violating federal immigration laws.

Result of "No" Vote

"No" vote retains law limiting (with exceptions) use of state / local law enforcement resources for detecting/apprehending persons suspected only of violating federal immigration laws.

Summary

Measure repeals ORS 181A.820, which limits (with exceptions) the use of state and local law enforcement money, equipment and personnel for "detecting or apprehending persons whose only violation of law" pertains to their immigration status. Current exceptions allow using law enforcement resources to:

- Detect or apprehend persons accused of violating federal immigration laws who are also accused of other violations of law;
- Detect or apprehend persons accused of violating federal immigration laws who are also accused of other violations of law;
- Arrest persons "charged by the United States with a criminal violation of federal immigration laws" who are "subject to arrest for the crime pursuant to a warrant of arrest issued by a federal magistrate";
- Communicate with federal immigration authorities to verify immigration status of arrested persons or "request criminal investigation information with reference to persons named in records of" federal immigration officials.

Estimate of Financial Impact

The financial impact is indeterminate.

Committee Members:

Secretary of State Dennis Richardson
 State Treasurer Tobias Read
 Katy Coba, Director, Department of Administrative Services
 Nia Ray, Director, Department of Revenue
 Debra Grabler, Local Government Representative

(The estimate of financial impact was provided by the above committee pursuant to ORS 250.127.)

Text of Measure

Be It Enacted by the people of the state of Oregon:

SECTION 1. ORS 181A.820 is repealed.

[ORS 181A.820 Enforcement of federal immigration laws. (1) No law enforcement agency of the State of Oregon or of any political subdivision of the state shall use agency moneys, equipment or personnel for the purpose of detecting or apprehending persons whose only violation of law is that they are persons of foreign citizenship present in the United States in violation of federal immigration laws.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1) of this section, a law enforcement agency may exchange information with the United States Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the United States Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services and the United States Bureau of Customs and Border Protection in order to:

(a) Verify the immigration status of a person if the person is arrested for any criminal offense, or

(b) Request criminal investigation information with reference to persons named in records of the United States Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the United States Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services or the United States Bureau of Customs and Border Protection.

(3) Notwithstanding subsection (1) of this section, a law enforcement agency may arrest any person who:

(a) Is charged by the United States with a criminal violation of federal immigration laws under Title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act or 18 U.S.C. 1015, 1422 to 1429 or 1505; and

(b) Is subject to arrest for the crime pursuant to a warrant of arrest issued by a federal magistrate.

(4) For purposes of subsection (1) of this section, the Bureau of Labor and Industries is not a law enforcement agency.

(5) As used in this section, "warrant of arrest" has the meaning given that term in ORS 131.005. [Formerly 181.850]

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

Explanatory Statement

Under Oregon Revised Statute 181A.820, state and local law enforcement agencies are prohibited from using agency moneys, equipment or personnel for detecting or apprehending persons whose only violation of law is that they are persons of foreign citizenship present in the United States in violation of federal immigration laws. There are three exceptions to the prohibition. The exceptions allow a state or local law enforcement agency to exchange information with federal immigration agencies to verify a person's immigration status if the person is arrested for another criminal offense, or to request criminal investigation information from federal immigration agencies that references a person named in federal immigration agency records. Further, a state or local law enforcement agency may use its resources to arrest a person who is charged with a criminal violation of immigration law and who is subject to arrest for that crime pursuant to an arrest warrant issued by a federal magistrate.

If enacted, this ballot measure would repeal the state law that prohibits state and local law enforcement agencies from using agency moneys, equipment or personnel for the purpose of detecting or apprehending persons suspected only of violating federal immigration law, as well as the exceptions to the prohibition. If enacted, the measure would allow state and local law enforcement agencies to use agency resources to detect and apprehend persons whose only violation of law is that they are persons who are in the United States in violation of federal immigration laws.

Committee Members:

Cynthia J. Kendoll
Richard F. LaMountain
Diane Goodwin
Kayse Jama
Edwin Peterson

Appointed by:

Chief Petitioners
Chief Petitioners
Secretary of State
Secretary of State
Members of the Committee

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

Argument in Favor

IMMIGRATION-LAW ENFORCEMENT A VALID ROLE FOR OREGON'S POLICE AND SHERIFFS

Oregonians should vote "yes" on Measure 105, repeal Oregon's illegal-immigrant sanctuary statute, and free our state's police and sheriffs to fully and freely aid U.S. immigration authorities.

Is this a valid role for local law-enforcement agencies? Yes. In *United States v. Vasquez-Alvarez* (1999), the U.S. Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals recognized a "pre-existing general authority of state or local police officers to investigate and make arrests for violations of federal law, including immigration laws."

Indeed, that's what Congress -- the very institution that creates immigration laws -- intended: U.S. law, the majority in the same case noted, "evinces a clear invitation from Congress for state and local agencies to participate in the process of enforcing federal immigration laws."

That participation is desperately needed. In a country of 325 million containing perhaps 20 million or more illegal immigrants, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's interior enforcement-and-removal agents number only a few thousand -- 5,800 in fiscal year 2016 and barely more than that today.

Local police and sheriffs, then, "are a vast potential force multiplier in immigration law enforcement," writes attorney Charles Smith. "They have regular, day-to-day contact with lawbreakers in the routine enforcement of their duties, and are therefore in a very advantageous first-line-of-defense position to help enforce the nation's immigration laws on a day-to-day basis."

Illegal immigrants routinely perpetrate crimes above and beyond their immigration-law violations -- crimes that can harm Oregonians. For this reason, helping federal authorities enforce immigration law should be a central duty of our police and sheriffs.

Your "yes" vote on Measure 105 will help repeal the state's illegal-immigrant sanctuary statute, prevent crime, and set us on the path to a safer Oregon.

Oregon State Senator Kim Thatcher

(This information furnished by Cynthia J Kendoll, Stop Oregon Sanctuaries - Authorized Agent.)

Argument in Favor

SANCTUARY LAW SHIELDS LAWBREAKERS FROM DETECTION

Oregonians should vote to repeal the state's illegal-immigrant sanctuary law. Why? Because it **handcuffs police and sheriffs in their ability to fulfill their primary responsibility: protecting those within their jurisdictions from crime.**

The sanctuary law perpetuates the idea that illegal immigrants who have not been charged or convicted of crimes beyond their immigration violations are likely innocent of further transgressions. This is a dangerous misconception. **People who break laws pertaining to a nation's very sovereignty will be prone to break other of its laws as well.**

A recent Federation for American Immigration Reform study of foreign nationals incarcerated by states and localities -- the great majority of whom are here illegally -- found that **"their share of the prison population was 50 percent higher than the prison share of natives."** And their crimes are serious: In one recent month, **three-quarters** of the nearly 1,000 criminal aliens confined in Oregon prisons were in for **homicide, assault, robbery, kidnapping, rape, sodomy and sex abuse.**

Fox News investigators have examined reports from the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics and other sources and found that illegal immigrants recently accounted for "20 percent of kidnapping sentences and 16 percent of drug-trafficking sentences" nationwide.

As well, on a routine basis, immigration-law violations are precursory to **identity theft and unlawful employment**, which also harm our fellow Americans. "Virtually all adult illegal aliens commit felonies in order to procure the documents they need to get jobs, to drive and to obtain other benefits," writes Ronald Mortensen, a fellow with the Center for Immigration Studies. Indeed, notes Mortensen, "the Social Security Administration and New York Times report that approximately **75 percent of illegal aliens have fraudulently obtained Social Security numbers.**"

And yet **Oregon's sanctuary law puts known and suspected illegal immigrants off-limits to police and sheriffs' closer scrutiny.** Who pays the price? Innocent Oregonians.

Repeal the dangerous sanctuary law. **Vote yes on Measure 105.**

(This information furnished by Richard F. LaMountain.)

Argument in Favor

SANCTUARY STATUTE UNDERMINES RESPECT FOR LAW

Why should Oregonians repeal the state's illegal-immigrant sanctuary statute? The main reason: It undermines respect for our most precious inheritance, the rule of law.

Our nation cannot remain sovereign without laws that regulate which foreign nationals come here, when, and in what numbers. So what happens when the state governments that should help enforce those laws instead cast them as unworthy of their police and sheriffs' attention -- and, indeed, take official action to shield illegal immigrants from the consequences of their lawbreaking? They subvert U.S. sovereignty and laws that safeguard that sovereignty; enable foreign nationals to evade U.S. laws they find inconvenient; and encourage even more foreign nationals to break those laws to enter or remain in our nation.

"The routine violation of immigration law within the interior of the country breeds contempt for the law in general, for the institutions of the United States and, ultimately, for the United States itself," writes attorney Charles Smith. When state law forces police and sheriffs to turn a blind eye to immigration violations, it compounds that contempt.

Remember: States are not sovereign entities. They have responsibilities to the nation of which they are a part. One of those is to inculcate respect for that nation's laws, and for the representative democracy by which Americans make those laws.

This issue is very personal to me. As did many illegal immigrants now living in Oregon, my father too was born south of the border -- in Mexico. He, however, went through the legal process to enter and remain in the United States. By doing so, he demonstrated respect for the sovereignty, law and citizens of his new country. Ultimately, he became an American citizen. The lessons his noble example taught me have guided me throughout my life -- and should provide an example to others as well.

Vote yes on Measure 105.

State Representative Sal Esquivel

(This information furnished by Cynthia J Kendoll, Stop Oregon Sanctuaries - Authorized Agent.)

Argument in Favor

PROTECT OREGONIANS -- REJECT SANCTUARY LAW

A ballot measure gives Oregonians the opportunity to change past policies implemented by the legislature. In this case, to repeal the statute that makes Oregon a sanctuary state. For me, this is a simple issue of right and wrong, lawful and unlawful, and, if we, as an individual state, will support U.S. immigration laws.

People suggest putting yourself in the shoes of those here illegally – and I have. If I were to illegally enter another country, had no documents, no visa or work permit, I would think it perfectly just for the government of that country to arrest me, detain me, impose any consequences due for breaking their laws, suffer those consequences and then be immediately deported. I would not expect special protections because of my actions.

Furthermore, the more we ignore those who break the law, the more we embolden them to continue. It's one thing to have laws that are difficult to enforce. It's quite another when we have laws that *are* enforceable, and we defiantly choose *not* to enforce them.

To believe Oregon should be a sanctuary state, refusing to cooperate with federal immigration authorities, is to support open borders with no inspection, allowing drug running, human trafficking, gangs and even terrorists into our country.

This is not only dangerous, it's foolish. Do those who support the idea of a sanctuary state, believe their own home should be a sanctuary home? Anyone is welcome, take what you want, stay as long as you want – no questions asked!

That's what Oregon is doing as a sanctuary state.

We have national immigration laws to keep order and protect the citizens of this country. If we do not enforce those laws and as a state recognize the value and importance of adhering to them, then we are negligent in the protection of the citizens of Oregon.

Vote yes on Measure 105.

Oregon State Representative Greg Barreto

(This information furnished by Cynthia J Kendoll, Stop Oregon Sanctuaries - Authorized Agent.)

Argument in Favor

REMOVE CRIMINAL ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS FROM OREGON

The Oregon Department of Corrections currently has 136 illegal immigrants incarcerated for murder, nearly 500 illegal immigrants incarcerated for rape or sexual assault and hundreds more jailed for other serious crimes -- kidnapping, robbery, burglary, assault, drug crimes and more. Hundreds more are arrested monthly by city and county law enforcement agencies on the full spectrum of criminal offenses. These aren't just numbers, these are thousands of Oregon citizens victimized year after year by illegal immigrant criminals who should not be here.

Oregon's victims are tired of sanctimonious platitudes from self-serving politicians, left-wing hate groups, corporate masters and a one-sided media -- they want action to resolve these 100 percent preventable crimes. Instead, they get Oregon's sanctuary statute which enables illegal immigrant criminals, provides them safe harbor and hampers law enforcement's ability to identify, detain and initiate enforcement and removal operations.

Oregon's sanctuary law undermines every critical responsibility of state government; that is, to ensure public safety, administer justice and spend tax dollars responsibly.

Oregon's sanctuary law undermines public safety as previously outlined and there is certainly nothing noble or just in undermining the rule of law and releasing criminal illegal immigrants back into our communities. Additionally, illegal immigrants cost Oregon taxpayers over \$1.2 billion yearly with nearly \$200 million for legal expenses and \$102,000.00 daily for incarceration.

Most undocumented immigrants have no criminal intent; however, those in Oregon who commit serious crimes must be removed, not protected. Yes on 105 is not about immigration sweeps, it is not about children or illegal immigrants living in Oregon. It is about repealing a fundamentally flawed state statute that harms Oregon's citizens. Law enforcement agencies must be enabled to collaborate and remove criminal illegal elements from our state and Oregon voters, from any side of the aisle, must come together to act in the best interest of Oregon by voting **YES on 105**.

Dr. Matt Wyatt Lt Col, USAF ret.

(This information furnished by Cynthia J Kendoll, Stop Oregon Sanctuaries - Authorized Agent.)

Argument in Favor

POLICE AND SHERIFFS SHOULD HELP ENFORCE IMMIGRATION LAW

In my 30-plus years in law enforcement, which includes thirteen as sheriff of Clatsop County, the most important thing I've learned is this: Respect for law is indispensable to a free and orderly nation.

That's why I urge Oregonians to vote "yes" on Measure 105 to repeal the state's illegal-immigrant sanctuary statute.

The statute undermines respect for law in significant ways. It tells illegal immigrants that Oregon considers violations of immigration law -- law intended to safeguard American sovereignty -- as unworthy of police and sheriffs' attention. In doing so, it normalizes, legitimizes and encourages more of those violations. And it invites the contempt of U.S. citizens and legal residents, whom Oregon expects to abide by all laws.

Helping enforce immigration law is a fundamental responsibility of police and sheriffs. Why? Because, though immigration violations are federal offenses, they are precursors to other crimes illegal immigrants routinely commit to seek to conceal their illegal presence -- crimes, like identity theft, that harm everyday Oregonians at the local level.

Such crimes are well within police and sheriffs' purview. But Oregon's "hands off" sanctuary statute works to keep law enforcement from focusing scrutiny on many of the people who commit them -- for the very reason that they are here illegally.

One of my colleagues cited the sanctuary statute as a reason his office released an illegal immigrant who had been deported multiple times. Shortly after his release, that illegal immigrant assaulted two women.

But what of illegal immigrants who themselves are crime victims? Would sanctuary's repeal make them hesitant to report those crimes for fear they'd be deported?

No. Already, without disclosing their identities, illegal immigrants can report crimes via law-enforcement agencies' anonymous telephone and online "tip lines."

Oregon's sanctuary statute shields illegal immigrants from the consequences of their lawbreaking. To repeal this dangerous statute, vote "yes" on Measure 105.

Clatsop County Sheriff Tom Bergin

(This information furnished by Cynthia J Kendoll, Stop Oregon Sanctuaries - Authorized Agent.)

Argument in Opposition

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 105 **It would make us less safe.**

Trust is the foundation of good policing. And nobody should be afraid to call the police.

But when police play the role of federal immigration agents, many immigrants will be too afraid to call them.

No matter what you look like, sound like, or where you were born, you should feel safe to report a crime, provide information to law enforcement, and seek help if you've been a victim of a crime.

Measure 105 would throw out Oregon's anti-racial-profiling law.

Current Oregon law states that police cannot stop, detain, or interrogate you just because of how you look. Measure 105 would throw out this law.

This anti-racial profiling law has been protecting Oregonians since it was passed with near-unanimous support from Republicans and Democrats 31 years ago.

Measure 105 would open the door to racial profiling and civil rights violations -- and divide immigrant and non-immigrant Oregonians.

Measure 105 would violate our Oregon values of fairness and looking out for our neighbors.

In Oregon we believe in welcoming others, including those who may seem different.

Immigrants living in Oregon are part of our families, communities, workplaces, and places of worship. They are our neighbors, friends and local business owners.

Like many of our families, immigrants join the long American tradition of coming here in search of a better life and the freedom and opportunity we offer.

Local police and law enforcement leaders agree: The best way to keep Oregon safe is to vote NO on 105.

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 105

Find more information at ORUnited.org

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition

Safety is Critical to Immigrant Families and Communities I am Voting No on Measure 105

My family emigrated from Mexico to California in 1951. We moved to Eugene in 1978. I'm 70 years old, I've spent most of my life in Oregon and I love this beautiful state.

Like many families before us, we came to the United States in search of a better life, and the freedom and opportunity it offered.

In the 1980s, many immigrant communities didn't trust law enforcement. Local police were working with federal immigration agents to target immigrant communities with road blocks, business raids and going door to door in neighborhoods to find people who might be undocumented.

As a result, immigrants were too afraid to report crimes, seek help if they had been victimized, provide information to police, or testify to help solve cases for fear that they would be targeted.

Immigrant communities care deeply about safety, which is why we wanted to work more closely with local police.

In 1987, I joined community members across the state to help pass Oregon's anti-profiling law, separating the roles of local police and immigration enforcement. The law passed with broad support: nearly every Republican and Democrat voted for it.

During the last three decades, we have worked together to improve trust and enhance safety within immigrant communities. This law also reduced racial profiling of Oregonians who were perceived to be immigrants.

Immigrants, no matter their status, shouldn't have to live in fear that doing basic things like going to work or school, or reporting a crime to the police, could result in harassment or their families being torn apart.

All communities, including immigrant communities, care about the safety of their families, which is why we are voting No on Measure 105.

Guadalupe Quinn, Eugene, Oregon

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Not Safe. Not Just. Not Oregon. No on Measure 105.)

Argument in Opposition

SHERIFF AND DISTRICT ATTORNEY OPPOSE 105

As elected law enforcement leaders, one of our primary obligations is to ensure public safety. Every community member has the right to live, work and raise a family in safety. This includes feeling safe and having access to justice.

As public safety leaders, we are aware of Measure 105, which seeks to repeal ORS 181A.820, an Oregon law that controls when local law enforcement agencies may use local resources to enforce federal immigration laws.

We are compelled to speak because we believe this ballot measure may negatively impact public safety.

Oregon's Legislature passed this law in 1987 to guide how and when local police can engage in enforcing federal immigration law. It states that police cannot use resources to detect or apprehend persons whose only law violation is federal immigration law. This law does not prohibit police from using resources to detect, apprehend or cooperate with immigration officials if someone has violated federal immigration law and committed a crime.

The current law provides no sanctuary to an undocumented immigrant who commits a crime here. In fact, it specifically authorizes police to share information with federal immigration authorities.

Current law strikes the right balance. Local police cannot enforce federal immigration laws but can cooperate and communicate with authorities if an undocumented immigrant commits a crime. While the current law could be improved or clarified, repealing it altogether is not the answer.

Measure 105 would likely create a chilling effect in our community. Certain immigrant populations may be less likely to report crimes, access justice services such as restraining orders, or testify as witnesses in court.

Our community is safer when citizens and non-citizens alike report crimes and testify in court so we can arrest and prosecute criminals. We believe current law strikes the right balance to keep our community safe.

We oppose the effort to repeal it.

Pat Garrett, Washington County Sheriff

Kevin Barton, Washington County District Attorney

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Not Safe. Not Just. Not Oregon. No on Measure 105.)

Argument in Opposition

**Public Health Professionals Warn:
Measure 105 Could Harm Health Care System,
Increase Emergency Room Visits**

Throwing out Oregon's anti-racial profiling law could harm the health of our communities and increase health care costs for everyone.

Measure 105 holds serious and negative implications for public health.

If Measure 105 passes, more patients will be afraid to get the help they need when sick, fearing health care providers might question their immigration status.

This means illnesses go undetected. People don't get early screenings for cancer or heart problems. They miss treatment. And too often, relatively minor medical issues develop into far more serious and even life-threatening illnesses.

And when patients don't seek preventative services, they end up getting health care in emergency rooms. This is costly and drives up insurance rates for everyone.

Measure 105 could also jeopardize the health of Oregon's children. If Measure 105 passes, parents may fear that they will be harassed or targeted at the hospital or clinic if they have a family member who is undocumented.

Public health professionals work every day to keep Oregon communities healthy and urge voters to REJECT Measure 105.

"Measure 105 compounds the anti-immigrant sentiment already felt by our patients; we know that even more of our patients will not visit our clinics for fear of leaving their homes. Virginia Garcia opposes this measure because we value diversity and because we know that our patients are healthier when they feel safe." —Gil Muñoz, Virginia Garcia Memorial Foundation

PUBLIC HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS ENDORSING NO ON 105:
Coalition of Oregon Professional Associations for Counseling and Therapy

*Oregon Health Equity Alliance
Oregon Latino Health Coalition
Oregon Nurses Association
Oregon Pediatric Society*

*Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility
Virginia Garcia Memorial Health Center and Foundation*

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition

What do Oregon Conservatives, Republicans and Independents think about Measure 105?

WE ARE VOTING NO

Jeff Stone
Lifelong Republican

Executive Director/CEO, Oregon Nurseries' PAC:

"I've been a Republican all my life and I'm voting no on Measure 105. We are all mad how Congress has failed to pass a sensible immigration law. Ill-conceived ballot measures will only hurt businesses and communities. It sends the wrong message about Oregon and let's Congress off the hook. We can do better. Please vote NO."

Lane Shetterly

Former Republican Oregon State Representative:

"Oregon's current law makes it safe for anyone to report a crime they experience or witness, regardless of their immigration status. This is not a Republican or Democratic issue. It's not about liberals or conservatives. It's about community safety for all of us."

Sal Peralta

Secretary, Independent Party of Oregon:

"Measure 105 is out of step with Oregon values and our independent spirit. It would open the door to racial profiling and civil rights violations and would divide immigrant and non-immigrant Oregonians. That's not the Oregon way and we should vote no on 105."

Greg Miller

Republican voter in Salem:

"All Oregonians, immigrants and non-immigrants alike, care about the safety of our families and our communities. Our local police are already stretched too thin, 911 calls in rural communities are going unanswered, and budgets are tight. Measure 105 would make these problems worse, diverting our tax dollars away from local public safety."

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Not Safe. Not Just. Not Oregon. No on Measure 105.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon's Environmental Advocates Urge Voters To Reject Measure 105

Eliminating Oregon's 31-year-old anti-profiling law would erode community trust, divert local police officers and funding away from community safety, and put civil rights at risk.

It would also put our environment at risk and intimidate communities that are hardest hit by environmental problems.

As environmentalists, we are committed to building an inclusive movement that creates a healthy environment for all. Measure 105 targets our most vulnerable community members and sows fear and division.

Immigrant communities and communities of color, the communities targeted by this measure, are also among the communities hardest hit by environmental problems. Environmental justice demands that we create a community where everyone feels comfortable engaging in the public processes to address these problems, not a culture of fear that inhibits participation.

People who have intimate connections to our air, land and water have the greatest incentive to protect it, the insights to understand it, and the on-the-ground opportunity to report environmental accidents and violations.

If law-abiding community members avoid public participation for fear of being detained by police, we compromise one of our most effective sources of front-line protection and long-term solutions.

We urge a NO vote on Measure 105.

ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS ENDORSING NO ON 105

350 PDX
Audubon Society of Portland
Climate Solutions
Ecotrust
Oregon Environmental Council
Oregon League of Conservation Voters
Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility
Oregon Wild
Rogue Climate
Sierra Club of Oregon
Verde

(This information furnished by Lindsey Scholten, Oregon League of Conservation Voters.)

Argument in Opposition

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 105 TO KEEP OREGON'S SANCTUARY LAW

In 1987, the Oregon legislature, with broad support, passed ORS 181A.820 making Oregon a "sanctuary state," which says that no law enforcement monies, equipment or personnel are to be used to detect or apprehend people suspected only of violating federal immigration law. Before the sanctuary law, Oregon state and local taxes were used to enforce federal immigration laws, which resulted in misusing public resources, and profiling and harassing ethnic citizens and non-citizens. Measure 105 would return Oregon to this discrimination and waste.

Sanctuary Law Supports Public Safety by:

- SUPPORTING Oregon law enforcement officials addressing actual crimes.
- PREVENTING PROFILING by race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, immigration status, sex, or gender, making all Oregonians safer.
- INCREASING TRUST in Oregon law enforcement. Without the sanctuary law, people may avoid reporting crimes or seeking help from police and other agencies if they fear that such actions could lead to arrest, deportation, or family separation.

Saving Public Resources, Prohibiting Discrimination and Profiling

- State and local law enforcement budgets are tight. Oregon taxpayer money should be used for Oregon law enforcement, not for paying federal immigration enforcement.
- Under Measure 105, someone could be unfairly stopped, detained or interrogated solely if they are SUSPECTED of being an undocumented immigrant, creating fear for all Oregonians.

Upholding American & Oregon Values

- Other than Native Americans, we all are descended from immigrants who came to this country to escape poverty, injustice, war, or lack of opportunity, or from ancestors brought as slaves.
- Recent immigrants add to our economy as health and restaurant workers, farm laborers, technology experts, business owners, educators and other professionals.
- Oregon represents a mix of people, cultures, ideas, languages, and talents. Our diversity makes us strong.

Oregon's sanctuary law has served us well. Keep Oregon a safe and welcoming state with equality and justice for all.

Vote for what is right for Oregon: **Vote NO on Measure 105.**

Oregonians for Sanctuary

(This information furnished by Jeanne B Raymond, Oregonians for Sanctuary.)

Argument in Opposition

Jewish Community Relations Council of the Jewish Federation of Greater Portland

Urges a NO VOTE on Measure 105

If I am not for myself, who will be for me? And if I am only for myself, what am I? And if not now, when?

Pirke Avot, Wisdom of our Ancestors 1:14

The organized Jewish community opposes Ballot Measure 105, which would repeal Oregon's current anti-racial profiling law.

The Hebrew Bible (Old Testament) directs us many times to welcome and have compassion for the stranger.

Our people's very survival in many eras has depended upon immigration. Many of our parents and grandparents fled war, persecution, and oppressive economic conditions. They came to this country to seek safety, reunite with family, create new homes, and carve out a new future in this country.

Like many families before them, today's immigrants journey to the United States in search of a better life, and the freedom and opportunity this country offers.

Our tradition calls on us to protect the most vulnerable among us.

Oregon's anti-racial profiling law has helped establish trust between law enforcement and immigrant communities. It has made all our communities safer. We oppose efforts to throw out that progress or to encourage discrimination against immigrants in Oregon.

We strongly urge a **NO VOTE on Measure 105**

Let us not allow the existing humanitarian laws now offered in Oregon to be overturned by Measure 105 - which is sponsored by an anti-immigrant hate group with ties to white nationalism.

We urge a **NO Vote on Measure 105**

Jewish Community Relations Council of Portland

Jewish Federation of Greater Portland's Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC) develops and articulates consensus positions concerning matters of public importance on behalf of its constituency. It is the public affairs coordinating and advisory body for the organized Jewish community of NW Oregon and SW Washington.

(This information furnished by Marc Blattner, Jewish Community Relations Council.)

Argument in Opposition

Former Police Chief Urges Oregonians To Vote NO on 105

As the former Police Chief for the City of Gresham, I know firsthand that community safety depends on maintaining trust.

Without this trust, crimes go unreported and criminals remain on the streets.

I will never forget a case where a woman was afraid to call us for help. Her husband beat her and she was afraid to report the crime and protect herself and her family for fear of being deported.

No one should be afraid to call the police for help. All Oregonians should feel confident seeking help from law enforcement to protect themselves and others from violence and crime.

This woman's story is a devastating glimpse at the tough choices that immigrants face every day as their families are being torn apart, and children are being thrown into detention camps.

Like many of our families, immigrants came to Oregon in search of a better life, freedom, and opportunity. They add to the diversity that is a defining strength of our country.

For more than 30 years, Oregon's anti-profiling law has been holding people who commit crimes accountable, while also protecting the civil rights of our neighbors.

This law gives clear guidance to law enforcement on complicated immigration issues. It ensures that local police time, resources, and facilities are invested in our communities to maintain safety.

Throwing out this law could turn local police into another arm of Trump's "deportation force."

Measure 105 chips away at community safety and diverts taxpayer money to do the job of federal immigration enforcement. We need to vote NO and ensure safety and fairness for everyone who lives in Oregon.

Carla Piluso
Former Police Chief, City of Gresham
Oregon State Representative

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Not Safe. Not Just. Not Oregon. No on Measure 105.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Law Enforcement Against Measure 105

As law enforcement professionals, we have a responsibility to keep our communities safe. We believe Oregon's current law makes Oregon's communities safer and we encourage Oregonians to vote NO on Measure 105.

Measure 105 could make community members feel less safe working with the police -- meaning they won't be as likely to report crimes or serve as witnesses at trial. That makes it harder for us to do our jobs.

Oregon law gives clear guidance to local law enforcement on complicated immigration issues. It doesn't protect those who commit crimes or harm others.

We encourage Oregonians to vote NO on 105.

Law Enforcement Leaders Urge You to Vote NO on 105

Jeff Auxier, Columbia County District Attorney

|

Jeff Barker, Retired Police Lieutenant and State Representative

|

Chris Gorsek, Former Police Officer & State Representative

|

John Haroldson, Benton County District Attorney

|

John Hummel, Deschutes County District Attorney

|

Jana Ince-Carey, Retired Gresham Police Officer

|

Ron Louie, Retired Hillsboro Police Chief

|

James I. Manning Jr., Former Police Officer & State Senator

|

Philip Mickel, Retired Oregon State Trooper

|

Dan Noelle, Retired Oregon Sheriff

|

Sheriff Mike Reese, Multnomah County

|

Kristine Olson, United States Attorney for the District of Oregon, 1994-2001

|

Carla Piluso, Former Police Chief, City of Gresham & State Representative

|

Rosie Sizer, Former Portland Police Chief

|

Ray Strack, Retired Special Agent, Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement

|

Rod Underhill, Multnomah County District Attorney

|

LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTION PARTNERSHIP

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Not Safe. Not Just. Not Oregon. No on Measure 105.)

Argument in Opposition

"When the immigrant resides with you in your land, you shall not oppress the immigrant. The immigrant who resides with you shall be to you as the citizen among you; you shall love the immigrant as yourself, for you were immigrants in the land of Egypt." (Leviticus 19:33-34)

These words from Hebrew scripture tell of a God who is deeply connected and concerned with the wellbeing of the poor, homeless, landless, and marginalized. As people of good faith, these words are both a reminder and an invitation to practice hospitality and justice not only in our churches but in our communities. As Christians, we also follow in the ways of Jesus who healed the sick, welcomed the outcast and embraced those in need. The United Church of Christ, has long spoken about the need to grant rights to immigrants and refugees and has called upon local churches to support immigrants within their own communities. Measure 105, which seeks to repeal Oregon's 30-year old inclusivity law, is not only an ill conceived and hateful proposal that will make our state less prosperous and less safe but also goes against our calling as followers of Christ.

This ballot measure is form of scapegoatism of the ugliest kind, based on fear mongering and racist assumptions. If passed, Measure 105 will create an atmosphere of suspicion, encourage racial profiling, drain much needed state and local funds in support of a misguided and inhumane federal program, and distract us from dealing with the real causes of our social and economic problems. In the Gospel of Luke we hear the greatest commandment is to 'Love the Lord your God with all your heart, soul, strength, and mind.' And to 'Love your neighbors as much as you love yourself.' It is for these reasons we stand with our immigrant neighbors, we reject fear and exclusion in all its many forms, and reject the idea that Measure 105 will bring equitable immigration reform.

(This information furnished by Amber C Churchill, Central Pacific Conference United Church of Christ.)

Argument in Opposition

Immigrant Rights Advocates Encourage You to VOTE NO ON 105.

In Oregon, we believe in fairness and looking out for our neighbors. Immigrants in Oregon are part of our families, communities, workplaces, and places of worship. We join the long American tradition of coming here in search of a better life, freedom and opportunity.

For 31 years, Oregon's sanctuary law has protected Oregonians from unfair racial profiling. Getting rid of this law opens the door to serious harassment and civil rights violations for our friends, families and coworkers, simply because they are perceived to be undocumented immigrants.

The most important job for local police is solving local crimes and keeping communities safe. Police need the trust of the community to do their jobs safely and effectively. That is why this law was passed in 1987 with near unanimous support of Republicans and Democrats.

This law gives clear guidance to local law enforcement on complicated immigration issues -- and has worked as intended for more than 30 years.

Throwing out this Oregon law could turn local police into another arm of Trump's deportation force. Immigrants, including those who may be undocumented, shouldn't have to live in fear that doing basic things like going to work or school could result in harassment or their families being torn apart.

JOIN OREGON'S LEADING IMMIGRANT RIGHTS GROUPS VOTING NO ON 105

*Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon
Causa Oregon
Interfaith Movement for Immigrant Justice
Latino Alliance of Lane County
Latino Network
Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste
Portland JACL
Unete, Center for Farm Worker Advocacy
Unidos Bridging Community
Unite Oregon
Verde
Voz*

Find More Information Online:

ORUnited.org

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition

Daughter of Immigrants Encourages You to Vote No on 105

Even though I was born in the United States, people often ask me where I am from. That's because I am bilingual and have brown skin.

I'm from Salem, Oregon, I tell them. And proud of it!

I am proud of my hometown and my state. Here in Oregon we believe in looking out for each other. We believe that if people work hard and play by the rules, they should be treated with respect and dignity. And no one should be singled out or treated differently based on the color of their skin or their accent.

My parents came to Oregon in the 1980s and worked in the fields. After years of hard work and scraping by, they were grateful to be able to become legal permanent residents and get on the path to citizenship. No such path exists today.

My parents say all of their hard work and sacrifices paid off when I graduated from McKay High School and again when I walked across the graduation stage at Willamette University.

But Measure 105 would mean that people like me and my parents could be stopped by police just based on the color of our skin, having an accent, or our perceived immigration status.

This measure throws out the anti-racial profiling law that has been in place my whole life. If Measure 105 passes, families like mine will be afraid of calling the police if we need help or testifying in a trial if we witness a crime.

Measure 105 would strike a blow to Oregon values of fairness and justice. Our local police could become part of the federal deportation force.

Please join me in voting no on 105 to protect the local law that reduced racial profiling and kept Oregon communities safe.

Reyna Lopez
Salem, Oregon

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition

Interfaith Movement for Immigrant Justice urges a NO vote on Measure 105

As religious leaders and people of faith, we are called to walk together, to welcome newcomers to our communities, and to treat each other as neighbors and family. Immigrants in Oregon are part of our families, communities, workplaces and places of worship.

We urge all people of faith to reject profiling and preserve our state as a sanctuary. As people of conscience, we urge you to Vote NO on Measure 105.

Sister Kathy Beckley, SNJM, Sisters of the Holy Name of Jesus and Mary

Bishop Dave Brauer-Rieke, Oregon Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Rabbi Benjamin Barnett, Havurah Shalom

Imam Muhsen Al Dhalimy

Gurpreet Singh, Secretary, Sikh Center of Oregon, Beaverton OR

To see additional endorsers go to: <http://imirj.org/no-on-105>

Vote NO on Measure 105

(This information furnished by Robert E Brown, Interfaith Movement for Immigrant Justice.)

Argument in Opposition

See What Oregon's Newspapers Say About The Broad Opposition To Measure 105

"Law enforcement and business leaders on Monday announced their opposition to an initiative petition to repeal the statewide sanctuary law."
The Daily Astorian (7/9/18)

"A wide range of immigrant advocacy, civil rights, religious and labor groups have lined up to oppose the 'sanctuary' law repeal."
The Register Guard (7/17/18)

"This week, District Attorney Kevin Barton and Sheriff Pat Garrett came out in opposition to Measure 105..."
Hillsboro Tribune, (8/9/18)

"In response to IP 22, new political action committee Oregonians United Against Profiling has sprung forth to defend the law, with supporters including: Nike, Oregon Center for Public Policy, Causa Oregon, Columbia Sportswear and various law enforcement officials."
Statesman Journal (7/17/18)

AND OREGON NEWSPAPERS ARE REPORTING ON THE CLEAR RISKS IF MEASURE 105 PASSES

"Opponents say the sanctuary law protects immigrants from profiling by local law enforcement and ensures people aren't afraid to report crimes or talk to law enforcement for fear they or a family member will be deported."
The Register Guard (7/27/18)

"Immigration advocates have expressed concerns that the removal of sanctuary state status could turn local law enforcement into a 'deportation force.' It could also make undocumented immigrants more hesitant to call the police, making communities less safe, they said."
Statesman Journal (7/17/18)

"If Initiative Petition 22 passes, Williams said, law enforcement would be free to racially profile people on the streets, demanding documentation of legal status from anyone they think might be in the country illegally."
The Bulletin (7/17/18)

PLEASE VOTE NO ON MEASURE 105

[Find More Information Online:](#)

ORUnited.org

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition

Unitarian Universalists urge you to vote No on Ballot Measure 105

Oregon Unitarian Universalist Voices for Justice is a statewide organization representing Unitarian Universalists in Oregon. We strongly endorse preservation of Oregon's sanctuary law. Our Unitarian Universalist principles recognize the worth and dignity of every person, calling for justice, equity and compassion in human relations. We actively work toward the goal of world community with peace, liberty and justice for all. Oregon's sanctuary law was adopted in 1987, responding to a wave of bigotry and hatred for Central American refugees seeking sanctuary from violence and oppression. Many of those refugees stayed in Oregon, becoming good neighbors and contributing to the strength and vitality of Oregon's communities. Today's migrants are fleeing similar violence in their home countries. Our obligation to welcome the stranger and provide refuge to those fleeing violence has not changed. Let us continue to welcome the stranger to Oregon. Unitarian Universalists urge Oregonians to vote NO on Measure 105.

(This information furnished by Kathleen G McKinney, Oregon UU Voices for Justice.)

Argument in Opposition

City Club of Portland Recommends a "NO" Vote on Measure 105

The current law establishing Oregon as a sanctuary state promotes trust with law enforcement, reduces racial profiling, and keeps families together. A volunteer research committee made up of City Club members investigated Measure 105 and found that repealing this law would endanger the lives and wellbeing of Oregonians.

City Club members reviewed the research and voted to approve it, recommending that Oregonians vote "no" in November.

Why vote NO?

- The state's sanctuary law was implemented after an incident of racial profiling led to a civil lawsuit. Since 1987—more than 30 years—Oregon's sanctuary law has been in place to protect communities of color from harassment based on assumptions about their immigration status.
- A repeal of the current law will damage community trust, which can affect public safety. If local law enforcement participates in immigration enforcement, undocumented immigrants will be less likely to provide information to the police or testify in court.
- Immigrants benefit the local economy. One in ten Oregonians is an immigrant and one in eight Oregon workers is an immigrant. Sending a message that Oregon is hostile to immigrants puts Oregon businesses at an economic disadvantage.
- This measure has been spearheaded by Oregonians for Immigration Reform, an organization that the Southern Poverty Law Center lists in its database of hate groups.

For the best interest of all Oregonians, let's keep our families together, provide protection against racial profiling, and maintain the separation between criminal and civil law enforcement. Vote NO on Measure 105.

About City Club of Portland

Since 1916, City Club of Portland has conducted nonpartisan research for the benefit of all Oregonians. Today, we're building on that legacy by bringing together a diverse community of thinkers and doers to spark change across our region.

For more information about City Club of Portland or to read our ballot measure reports, visit www.pdxcityclub.org, email info@pdxcityclub.org, or call 503-228-7231.

(This information furnished by City Club of Portland, Julia Meier, Executive Director.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Business Leaders Agree:

Measure 105 is Bad for Business, Bad for Oregon

"Nike employs people from all over the world; we can attest to the unique value, contributions, and innovations that people from diverse backgrounds add to Nike and to Oregon's culture and economy. Ending Oregon's sanctuary law will damage Oregon's long-standing track record as a place that attracts diverse talent from across the globe."

Mark Parker

Chairman, President and CEO, Nike, Inc.

|

"Thanks to Oregon's culture of openness and looking out for its neighbors, my family was able to emigrate to Oregon from Nazi Germany and live here without fear. Oregon is enriched by our diversity, and immigrants living in Oregon are part of our families, communities, workplaces, and places of worship. Measure 105 does not align with Oregon values."

Tim Boyle

President and CEO, Columbia Sportswear Company

|

"The Oregon wine industry depends on a diverse workforce. With requisite skills ranging from agriculture to food science, we depend on a wide array of experience for our success. Immigrants in Oregon who work in the wine industry are a vital ingredient in our success. Measure 105 is not only discriminatory but self-defeating. Please VOTE NO."

Amy Prosenjak

President, A to Z Wineworks

|

"As business leaders, we know that diversity has made Oregon stronger. Some of our greatest industries, like technology, manufacturing, agriculture and so many others, have been built by innovation brought to us by immigrants. "

Christine Vernier and David Vernier

Co-Founders, Vernier Software

VOTE NOTE ON MEASURE 105

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Not Safe. Not Just. Not Oregon. No on Measure 105.)

Argument in Opposition

**I Was Racially Profiled by Federal Agents
Vote No on Measure 105**

I've been an American citizen for 26 years. I've worked in Washington County for two decades. I coach youth soccer teams and have dedicated my career to helping my community.

But last September, my wife and I were racially profiled by federal immigration agents outside the Washington County Courthouse.

Without identifying themselves, plain-clothes agents surrounded us, demanded my ID and gave no explanation or reason. They were looking for a man whose only resemblance to me was the color of my skin.

My wife and I were scared. They were following and targeting us. No one should be racially profiled. Unfortunately, my experience is part of Oregon's history of federal agents unlawfully targeting people who look like immigrants.

I love being an American citizen—I have raised my kids here. Oregon is our home.

What happened to me should never happen to anyone. It's humiliating and frightening for my family. If Measure 105 passes, racial profiling could get worse. Local police could be forced to become part of Trump's deportation force—tearing apart families, friends, and communities.

We should work together to respect one another and build stronger communities.

I have faith that Oregonians will reject this measure. As Oregonians, we believe in fairness and treating everyone with kindness, dignity and respect. That's what keeps our community strong.

I ask you to join me in voting No on Measure 105.

Isidro Andrade-Tafolla, Hillsboro, Oregon

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition

**The Service Employees International Union (SEIU)
Local 503 & Local 49:**

NO on 105.

SEIU represents more than 70,000 healthcare, property services, homecare and public services workers in Oregon. We are a diverse union with people of all colors and many different nationalities. Measure 105 will lead to people of color being racially profiled at work and in our communities. That is unacceptable.

Measure 105 would repeal Oregon's "sanctuary" law. This law was passed by Republicans and Democrats more than 30 years ago and has been protecting Oregonians from unfair racial profiling ever since. Voting NO on Measure 105 will keep the existing law in place, protecting people of color from searches or from being detained just because someone thinks they are an immigrant.

Whether you're a janitor in Portland, a homecare worker in La Grande or a hospital employee in Eugene, you should not be harassed or detained because of the color of your skin or because you have an accent. That's why our union urges a NO on Measure 105.

Voting NO on Measure 105 will also keep our local law enforcement dollars focused on local issues, instead of being used to enforce federal immigration laws.

Please vote NO to protect Oregonians from unfair racial profiling and keep law enforcement resources local.

SEIU says NO to 105.

(This information furnished by Elvyss Argueta, SEIU.)

Argument in Opposition

The Immigration Taskforce of the Oregon-Idaho Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church, urges a NO vote on Ballot Measure 105

When a foreigner resides among you in your land, do not mistreat them.

The foreigner residing among you must be treated as your native-born.

Love them as yourself, for you were foreigners in Egypt. I am the Lord your God. (Leviticus 19:33-34)

The United Methodist Church understands that at the center of Christian faithfulness to scripture is the call we have been given to love and welcome the sojourner. The vast majority of people now living in Oregon are the descendants of immigrants who migrated here seeking safety, security and prosperity. Regardless of status and documentation, immigrants and refugees sit in our pews and are behind the pulpits of our churches, and they have added to our witness for Christ as we have all dedicated ourselves to the church's mission of making disciples of Jesus Christ for the transformation of the world. As disciples of Jesus Christ we are called to treat our migrant and immigrant neighbors with compassion, and offer them every hospitality.

We ask our faith communities to take a stand to protect everyone who comes into their churches or facilities regardless of their legal standing to be in the United States. **We urge you to Vote NO on Measure 105.**

The Immigration Taskforce is a committee of the Oregon-Idaho Conference of The United Methodist Church that is made up of clergy and lay members to help provide guidance to churches seeking to be in ministry to immigrants in our communities.

(This information furnished by Adam Briddell, The Immigration Taskforce of the Oregon-Idaho Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church.)

Argument in Opposition

Multnomah Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) opposes Ballot Measure 105. It would allow the use of state resources funded by our tax dollars to support discriminatory practices such as racial profiling.

We believe it is our responsibility as people of faith to honor and protect every person equally, and we strive to build communities of trust, compassion and tolerance. We seek ways to strengthen the bonds of unity among all people and believe that our common humanity transcends our differences.

In our experience, everyone benefits when immigrants feel welcome and fully participate in all aspects of our democratic society. We believe that every individual is worthy of respect, regardless of country of origin, the circumstances of coming to live in Oregon, or citizenship status.

Ballot Measure 105 would increase uncertainty within all of our communities, erode trust of the civic institutions that are meant to protect us, and decrease the safety of all. Measure 105 would allow the use of public resources to target people based on characteristics such as skin color, accent and occupation. Families and communities would be disrupted and left vulnerable, economically and socially. The effects of Measure 105 would be fear and division, which are in direct opposition to the principles of our faith. We ask our fellow Oregonians, as they cast their ballots, to employ their power to reconcile and unify us rather than to exploit fear and divide us.

Please join us in voting NO on Measure 105.

(This information furnished by Elizabeth Fischer, Clerk, Multnomah Friends Meeting.)

Argument in Opposition

The Oregon Building Trades Council Urges You to Vote NO on Measure 105

The Oregon Building Trades Council represents more than 30,000 construction workers in the skilled trades. OBTC prides itself on actively recruiting people of color and people from diverse backgrounds and ensuring a safe environment for all workers in our trades.

Oregon's 31-year-old sanctuary law prevents state and local law enforcement from arresting individuals *when their ONLY violation is of federal immigration law*. If Measure 105 passes, it would have a negative impact on Building Trades' members and their families.

Measure 105 would:

Hurt Workers: Measure 105 would increase workers' vulnerability to abuse and exploitation by unscrupulous businesses in the construction industry. If passed, this would drive a wedge between represented and unrepresented workers, making it twice as hard for us to educate and protect workers who are being exploited.

Kill Jobs: Oregon's sanctuary law was originally passed with support from Republicans and Democrats who did not want state resources used to backfill deficit spending of the federal government. If it is repealed, the state will lose millions of taxpayer dollars that could otherwise go toward public infrastructure projects and education.

Reduce Public Safety: Oregon's sanctuary law protects against racial profiling by local and state law enforcement. Without this protection, individuals will live in fear of being profiled based on their ethnicity or perceived immigration status and may be less likely to engage with law enforcement. Law enforcement already has the ability to arrest individuals when they commit criminal violations independent of their immigration status.

PLEASE JOIN THE OREGON BUILDING TRADES' 30,000 MEMBERS IN VOTING NO!

– Robert Camarillo, Executive Secretary

OBTC is comprised of 22 member unions representing boilermakers, bricklayers, cement masons, electrical workers, elevator constructors, floor coverers, glass workers, heat and frost insulators, iron workers, laborers, office and professional employees, operating engineers, painters, plasterers, plumbers and steamfitters, roofers, sheet metal workers, sprinkler fitters, and teamsters.

(This information furnished by Robert Camarillo, Executive Secretary, Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council.)

Argument in Opposition

Los defensores de los derechos de los inmigrantes le sugieren a que voten NO EN LA MEDIDA 105.

En Oregon nosotros creemos en la igualdad y ver por nuestros vecinos. Nosotros nos unimos a la larga tradición Americana de llegar aquí en busca de una mejor vida, libertad y oportunidad.

Por 31 años, la ley "santuaría" de Oregon ha protegido a los inmigrantes contra la discriminación injusta. Deshacerse de esta ley abriría la puerta a violaciones de derechos civiles para nuestros amigos, familias y compañeros de trabajo, simplemente por ser percibidos como inmigrantes indocumentados.

Es por eso que la ley fue pasada en 1987 con el apoyo casi unánime de republicanos y demócratas.

Deshacerse de nuestra ley pondría a Oregon en compañía de estados como Texas y Arizona, donde "muéstrame tus papeles" se ha convertido en una nueva realidad para los inmigrantes. Tirando esta ley de Oregon podría convertir a la policía local en otro brazo de la fuerza de deportación de Trump. Los inmigrantes, incluyendo los inmigrantes indocumentados, no deberían tener que vivir con miedo al acoso o a que sus familias sean destruidas cuando simplemente van a trabajar o a la escuela o a reportar un crimen.

Esta ley podría resultar en el acoso y en la destrucción de las familias inmigrantes. Estos no son nuestros valores como Oregonianos.

ÚNETE EN VOTAR NO A LA MEDIDA 105

*Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon
Causa Oregon
Interfaith Movement for Immigrant Justice
Latino Alliance of Lane County
Latino Network
Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste
Portland JAACL
Unete, Center for Farm Worker Advocacy
Unidos Bridging Community
Unite Oregon
Verde
Voz*

Para más información:

ORUnited.org

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition

NAACP Oregon Chapters Say NO to Measure 105

The NAACP has a longstanding policy against racial profiling and has always strongly supported the rights of immigrants.

Getting rid of Oregon's anti-profiling law would remove protections against racial profiling and open Oregon up to becoming a "show me your papers" state where people can be harassed and detained for their perceived immigration status.

The NAACP also remains committed to preventing the fusion of police responsibilities and immigration enforcement as part of our goal to protect the rights of people of color.

The effort to throw out our 31-year-old anti-profiling law is a part of a troubling wave of anti-immigrant sentiment similar to the type of treatment the black community has historically experienced at the hands of law enforcement and other government officials.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEADERS AGREE: MEASURE 105 IS UNJUST AND UNSAFE

Tossing out this law will contribute further to the criminalization of people of color and mass incarceration.

When filling out your ballot, remember these simple points:

- Laws that encourage discrimination have no place in Oregon. Police should never investigate or detain people based on their skin or accent.
- Measure 105 undermines public safety by making people scared to come forward as victims or witnesses of crimes.
- Measure 105 could divert Oregon taxpayer money that could be used to solve real crime in our neighborhoods.
- Local law enforcement should be focused on our local communities and developing relationships with all Oregonians, including immigrant Oregonians.
- Local police should not be turned into another arm of President Trump's deportation force.

Vote for justice. Vote NO on Measure 105.

NAACP of the Corvallis area
 NAACP of Eugene & Springfield
 NAACP of Portland
 NAACP of Salem & Keizer

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition**Organizations You Trust Encourage a NO Vote on Measure 105**

The following groups encourage a NO vote on Measure 105 because Oregonians believe in fairness and looking out for our neighbors.

Oregon law states that police cannot stop, detain or interrogate any Oregonian just because of how they look. This law has protected our civil rights and helped reduce racial profiling. Measure 105 will erase those gains, once again opening the door to widespread racial profiling.

That's why law enforcement leaders, businesses, immigrant rights advocates, women's groups, nurses, farmers, teachers, labor unions, rural and urban groups, progressives and conservatives, and more all support a NO vote on Measure 105.

Organizations encouraging a NO vote on Measure 105

ACLU of Oregon, Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon
 Basic Rights Oregon, Beyond Toxics, Bus Project
 Causa Oregon, Children First for Oregon
 Coalition of Communities of Color, Common Cause Oregon
 Democratic Party of Oregon, Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon
 Family Forward Oregon, Forward Together
 Interfaith Movement for Immigrant Justice
 Jewish Voice for Peace Portland
 Latino Alliance of Lane County, Latino Network
 Main Street Alliance of Oregon, NARAL Pro-Choice Oregon
 Neighborhood Partnerships, Independent Party of Oregon
 NW Health Foundation, Oregon Education Association
 Oregon Abuse Advocates and Survivors in Service
 Oregon AFL-CIO, Oregon Coalition of Christian Voices
 Oregon Food Bank, Oregon Health Equity Alliance
 Oregon Justice Resource Center
 Oregon Latino Health Coalition, Oregon NOW
 Oregon Nurseries' PAC, Oregon Nurses Association
 Oregon Pediatric Society
 Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility
 Oregon PTA, Oregon Rural Action
 Oregon Working Families Party
 Partnership for Safety and Justice
 Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste
 Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon
 Portland JAFL, Portland Jobs with Justice
 Rural Organizing Project, SEIU Locals 49 & 503
 Stand for Children, SURJ Springfield-Eugene
 Law Enforcement Action Partnership,
 Unidos Bridging Community, Unite Oregon
 Virginia Garcia Memorial Health Center and Foundation
 Voz, YWCA of Greater Portland

And more...

Find the rest at QRUnited.org

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition**Oregon Has Been Shaped by Immigrants
Reject Hate and Vote Against Measure 105**

In a world full of ambiguities, it is clear to us that Oregonians should VOTE NO on Measure 105.

As educators, we believe that classrooms and campuses should be centers for the safe exchange of ideas and creative thought. A climate of hate and fear does not advance knowledge. It only divides and isolates our communities, while stifling innovation and discovery.

That is why we must reaffirm our compassion and commitment to one another regardless of immigration status.

All Oregonians are valued and welcomed because of their diversity, not in spite of it. Our many differences enrich our state and enhance learning environments at our universities and community colleges. They help our economy flourish.

The United States became great because it was founded and built by immigrants. It remains great because of the millions of people and families, including our ancestors, who risked everything for a better life for their children and to escape religious, ethnic, and political oppression.

As Oregonians and as educators, we personally believe in fairness and looking out for our neighbors. As such, we are VOTING NO on Measure 105.

Michael Schill
 President of the University of Oregon
 (title used for identification purposes only)

Ed Ray
 President of Oregon State of University
 (title used for identification purposes only)

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, No on Measure 105.)

Argument in Opposition

Cuando me mudé por primera vez a Oregón, los inmigrantes eran el blanco principal para la policía, independientemente de su estatus legal.

Recuerdo caminar a casa una tarde y presenciar a un oficial de policía local apuntando a las casas mientras los agentes federales derribaban sus puertas y sacaban a familias arrastrándolos de sus hogares. Fue terrible ver a estas familias, especialmente los niños llorando, y recibir este trato.

En ese momento, los oficiales no tenían idea si esas familias eran ciudadanos, tenían permisos de trabajo legal o eran indocumentados. Fueron seleccionados simplemente por el color de su piel.

Todo eso cambió en 1987, cuando los legisladores republicanos y demócratas se unieron para aprobar la primera ley santuario de la nación para reducir el perfil racial.

Gracias a esta ley, las cosas mejoraron mucho en Oregón.

Todos los días, escuchamos más y más historias de residentes de mucho tiempo que son enviados a un país que ni siquiera conocen, de familias inmigrantes separadas, redadas de inmigración, y niños siendo separados de sus padres y colocados en centros de detención.

Nosotros necesitamos esta ley ahora más que nunca.

Votando No a la Medida 105 mantendrá la ley como está, asegurando que:

- La policía local, fondos, equipos y las instalaciones no sean utilizadas para perseguir y detener a personas sospechosas solo de violar la ley federal de inmigración.

- Los Oregonianos no pueden ser parados, detenidos o ser interrogados sólo porque alguien piensa que pueden ser inmigrantes indocumentados.

No podemos volver a cómo era antes de que existiera esta ley.

Le pido que voten no en la Medida 105.

Ramón Ramirez
Líder de los derechos civiles
Residente de Oregón por 42 años

Para más información:

ORUnited.org

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition

Sanctuary Temple Beth Israel advises a NO vote on Ballot Measure 105

Fundamental to Jewish tradition and teaching is concern for those who may be strangers in the community. In fact, the instruction to care for the stranger is mentioned more times than *any* other commandment in the Bible — more even than the commandment to love God.

Most Oregonians, as most other Americans, are immigrants or descendants of immigrants. The richness of our community is founded on the contributions of people from many cultures and many lands. There must be no place in Oregon for unkindness to immigrants and refugees, whether they are documented or not.

There are also practical matters to consider. Our local law enforcement officers are already stretched too thin. If they are asked to also serve as immigration police, their work for our communities will be negatively affected. If immigrants and refugees are afraid to help law enforcement, our local officers' work will again be obstructed. In the end, if the Measure passes, we will all be less safe.

Sanctuary Temple Beth Israel urges you to Vote NO on Measure 105

(This information furnished by Judy L Boles, Coordinator, Sanctuary Temple Beth Israel.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Mayors Oppose Measure 105

We, as Oregon mayors, are opposed to Measure 105 and ask Oregonians to vote NO on 105. Oregon's anti-profiling law has been working as intended for over 31 years.

The law provides clear guidance to local law enforcement on how to handle complex immigration issues, while also protecting civil rights.

Local law enforcement personnel, funds, equipment and facilities should be used to solve local crimes and keep communities safe -- not to pursue and detain people suspected only of violating federal immigration law.

Immigrants, including those who may be undocumented, shouldn't be afraid to report a crime or testify at a trial. As Oregon mayors, we urge our fellow Oregonians to vote NO on Measure 105.

Oregon Mayors Voting NO on 105

Mayor Bob Andrews, Newberg

Mayor Chuck Bennett, Salem

Mayor Paul Blackburn, Hood River

Mayor Steve Callaway, Hillsboro

Mayor Mark Gamba, Milwaukie

Mayor John McArdle, Independence

Mayor Steve Milligan, Monmouth

Mayor Kyle B. Palmer, Silverton

Mayor Lucy Vinis, Eugene

Find More Information Online:

ORUnited.org

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition

When I first moved to Oregon, immigrants were regularly targeted by police, regardless of their legal status.

I vividly remember walking home one evening and witnessing a local police officer pointing at houses while federal agents would bust down their doors and drag entire families out of their homes. It was heartbreaking to watch these families, including crying children, treated like this.

At the time, officers had no idea if these families were citizens, had legal work permits or were undocumented. They were singled out because of the color of their skin.

All that changed in 1987 when Republican and Democratic lawmakers came together to pass the nation's first anti-racial profiling law.

Thanks to this law, things got a lot better in Oregon.

Every day, we hear more and more stories of long-time residents being sent to a country they don't even know, of immigrant families being torn apart, ICE raids, and children being separated from their parents and placed in detention camps.

Oregon law currently protects Oregonians from unfair profiling.

We need this now more than ever before.

Being an Oregonian means welcoming others, including those who may seem different, and building those bridges of understanding. We can't go back to what it was like before this law existed.

I ask you to vote no on Measure 105.

Ramón Ramirez
Civil Rights Leader
42-year Oregon resident

Find More Information Online:

ORUnited.org

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition

Preserving Oregon's anti-racial profiling law is a matter of public safety, and it is essential for crime survivors' protection, safety, and healing.

That is why crime survivor advocates are voting No on Measure 105.

Our public safety system and the communities they serve must be able to respond to crime, hold people appropriately accountable, and take steps to prevent crime. Throwing out our anti-racial profiling law would undermine these safeguards and compromise our communities' security.

Oregon's current law protects crime victims because it allows people who have experienced trauma or witnessed violence to access the justice system without fearing arrest, deportation, or racial profiling.

Measure 105 would prevent crime survivors from reporting crime committed against them. When victims are in fear of the justice system, they are less safe, they miss out on essential trauma recovery services, and their voices are silenced.

Measure 105 would create fear for witnesses who want or need to testify about a crime. Community safety requires community-wide support. To ensure that people are held appropriately responsible for the harm they cause, reporting is key. We must protect witnesses' safety, not penalize them for simply being a bystander.

Measure 105 would put public safety at risk. Our communities are safer when local dollars are invested in local crime prevention and survivor services. Crime victim resources are scarce enough, and we need more access to critical services, not less. Measure 105 would funnel our local law enforcement toward responding to federal immigration issues, diverting local dollars away from critical services that people need in moments of crisis.

Oregon's sanctuary status is essential for public safety, for crime victims' protection, and for survivors' healing. We urge you to vote No on Measure 105.

Oregon Abuse Advocates and Survivors In Service
Oregon Attorney General's Sexual Assault Task Force
Oregon Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence
Partnership for Safety and Justice

(This information furnished by Iris Maria Chavez, Vice-chair.)

Argument in Opposition

**Oregon newspapers agree:
Vote NO on Measure 105**

INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER EDITORS ACROSS THE STATE
HAVE REVIEWED MEASURE 105 AND ARE ENCOURAGING
VOTERS TO REJECT THIS PROPOSAL

"Measure 105 is wholly unnecessary."

-- Editorial Board, *The Oregonian*, August 5, 2018

"Oregonians should not let a hate group define this beautiful state as a place that welcomes only white people."

-- Editorial Board, *The Statesman Journal*, Salem, July 20, 2018

"Local law enforcement benefits when all immigrants feel they can call their city, county or state law enforcement without fear. Immigrants benefit from knowing law enforcement is a safe haven. And we all benefit when each level of government sticks to its lane..."

-- Editorial Board, *The Newberg Graphic*, Newberg, August 1, 2018

"In this fraught social and political climate, we see no reason to change course with this policy. To do so would be to fall prey to a rising tide of xenophobia and racism in our community, state and nation. What's more, our local law enforcement officials should not be empowered to act as federal immigration agents. They already have enough to do."

-- Editorial Board, *The Source Weekly*, Bend, July 18, 2018

**WE TRUST OUR LOCAL, INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPERS
TO REPORT THE TRUTH!**

**If Oregon newspaper editorial boards are concerned
about Measure 105, then you should be too!**

Please vote NO on 105.

Find More Information Online:

ORUnited.org

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition

**Oregon Law Enforcement Officials
Oppose Measure 105**

"Oregon's current law strikes the right balance between accountability and protection. People who commit crimes can be held accountable and important civil rights are protected. Oregon law does both. I'm voting NO on 105."

—Ron Louie, Retired Hillsboro Police Chief

"I served as Oregon's top federal prosecutor for seven years. The state's anti-racial profiling law has worked as intended for more than 30 years. It allows local police to provide fingerprint data to the FBI, which notifies the Department of Homeland Security and immigration officials. Local police also can and do hold unauthorized immigrants and turn them over to immigration officers when a there is a warrant issued by a judge."

—Kristine Olson, United States Attorney for the District of Oregon, 1994–2001

"Oregon law provides clear guidance to local law enforcement officers on how to handle complicated immigration issues. It creates a bright line that focuses local police on solving local problems."

—Sheriff Mike Reese, Multnomah County

"Oregon has had a common sense law for 30 years that lets local law enforcement focus on catching criminals and lets immigration authorities do their job too. This law helps witnesses and victims of all backgrounds know that it is safe to talk to prosecutors, so we can work together for public safety."

—Jeff Auxier, Columbia County District Attorney

"If people are afraid to call the police for fear of being prosecuted for their immigration status, some crimes will go unreported by witnesses, while other victims won't feel comfortable turning to us for help. To keep our communities safe, we need to keep Oregon's sanctuary law in place."

—James I. Manning Jr., Former Police Officer & Oregon State Senator

"This law ensures that every ounce of local law enforcement's time, resources, and energy is invested in our communities to maintain safety."

—John Haroldson, Benton County District Attorney

**OREGON LAW ENFORCEMENT SAY:
VOTE NO ON MEASURE 105
TO KEEP OREGON COMMUNITIES SAFE**

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Not Safe. Not Just. Not Oregon. No on Measure 105.)

Argument in Opposition

VIETNAM VETERAN VOTING NO ON 105

I grew up in a small town and only really knew other white people until I went to Vietnam as a soldier in 1968.

All of a sudden I was training and serving alongside people from so many different racial and ethnic groups in the U.S. Army. It was truly eye-opening to suddenly be thrust into a diverse world with people from all different backgrounds in the U.S. Army.

I served with people from all around the world, especially from neighboring countries in Latin America. I learned that every ethnicity has lots to offer, and that what mattered most was tapping into the fierce will of the human soul to live.

When you are trying to survive in a war zone, you learn to rely on and trust the guy next to you. Even with people who don't look like you or sound like you. You look for the similarities, while still being able to enjoy and celebrate the differences in language and culture.

Those years in the war offered lessons I have carried with me ever since.

Measure 105 flies in the face of everything my fellow veterans and I fought for in Vietnam.

Now that I live in Forest Grove, small-town Oregon, I see even more clearly how diversity is the very essence of what makes America strong. Immigrants from all over the world live here, and I see them making valuable contributions to our community.

Let's not go back to the time before this law, when people in Oregon were racially profiled simply because they were perceived to be immigrants.

I ask that my fellow Oregonians vote NO on Measure 105.

Oregon has long been a sanctuary for me and I want it to be so for anyone who chooses to live here.

David Smith

Vietnam Veteran, Sergeant, U.S. Army

Forest Grove resident

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition

As Oregon's unions, we encourage our members and all workers to

Vote No on Measure 105.

We stand shoulder-to-shoulder in our efforts to improve the lives of working Oregonians.

Immigrants living in Oregon are part of our unions, part of our communities and an important part of Oregon.

They are our neighbors, our friends, our coworkers and join the long tradition of coming to this country in search of a better life, freedom, and opportunity. We must preserve that tradition for future generations.

Measure 105 opens the door to serious civil rights violations and more racial profiling of Oregonians, simply because they are perceived to be undocumented immigrants.

Every day, we hear about long-term residents being sent to a country they do not even know because of misguided immigration enforcement. We hear about families being torn apart and children being detained.

Oregon's unions stand against Measure 105. We shouldn't throw out Oregon's anti-profiling law -- that would put immigrant workers in fear, driving them underground.

Workers should never be afraid to go to their job, take their kids to school, attend church, or go anywhere else in the community for fear of harassment.

Current law allows law enforcement to stay focused on local crimes and provides important civil rights protections. That's why we encourage a NO vote on Measure 105: to keep Oregon communities safe and ensure working people do not live in fear.

LABOR UNIONS ENDORSING NO ON 105

American Federation of Teachers - Oregon

Cement Masons Local 555

IBEW Local 48

International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, DC 5

Ironworkers Local 29

Oregon AFL-CIO

Oregon AFSCME

Oregon Education Association

Oregon Nurses Association

Oregon School Employees Association

Pacific NW Regional Council of Carpenters

Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste

SEIU Local 49

SEIU Local 503

United Food & Commercial Workers Local 555

(This information furnished by Tom Chamberlain, Oregon AFL-CIO.)

Argument in Opposition

**Second Generation Oregon Farmer
Voting NO on Measure 105**

The success of Oregon's farming industry depends on immigrant workers. We work closely with our immigrant communities; we know their stories. They have journeyed to Oregon in search of a better life, and the freedom and opportunity America offers.

Oregon is Number One in the nation for some of America's most well-known agricultural exports -- Christmas trees, hazelnuts, blackberries, and many more. Agriculture is a top economic driver in the state, economically linked to \$50 billion of all Oregon sales and creating over 326,000 of full and part-time jobs in Oregon.

We work with immigrants frequently -- at our farm and at the farms we partner with. These immigrants share their expertise and innovation with us, making our work all the more successful. The health of our farming industry could be seriously harmed without the contributions of immigrant workers in Oregon.

We think of the food we grow as binding elements of culture and connection, through hands in the dirt, to agrarian cultures the world over. Diversity is one of America's greatest strengths, and that can be seen in the agricultural sector from who grows our food and how, to who harvests it and cooks with it.

To preserve the strength of one of Oregon's most vibrant, successful sectors, please vote no on Measure 105.

- Charlene Murdock, Foodways at Nana Cardoon, a farm in Forest Grove

Find More Information Online:

ORUnited.org

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Oregonians United Against Profiling.)

Argument in Opposition

**Oregon's Anti-Profiling Law Has
Worked Well For More than 30 Years
Vote NO on Measure 105**

Oregon's anti-racial profiling law has worked as intended for more than 30 years, giving clear guidance to local law enforcement on complicated immigration issues. This law keeps our police focused on safety in our communities.

Oregon's current law allows local police to:

- Locate and detain undocumented immigrants who break Oregon law.

- Provide fingerprint data for all arrests to the FBI, which notifies the Department of Homeland Security and immigration officials of an arrest.
- Check the immigration status of people who have been arrested for breaking Oregon law.
- Hold unauthorized immigrants and turn them over to immigration officers if they have a warrant issued by a judge.

**OREGON LAW ENFORCEMENT LEADERS
ENCOURAGE A NO VOTE ON 105**

"This law has worked well for 30 years, holding people who commit crimes accountable while also protecting civil rights. Throwing out this law will divert our local law enforcement officers away from solving local crimes, making rural communities less safe."

—John Hummel, Deschutes County District Attorney

"Trust is the foundation of good policing. When police play the role of federal immigration agents, many immigrants will be too afraid to report a crime, seek help if they have been victimized and provide information to police that can help solve cases. That's why I oppose Measure 105."

—Dan Noelle, Retired Oregon Sheriff

"It is a waste of taxpayer money to use local police resources to enforce immigration violations. Police should be focused on public safety and enforcing state criminal codes."

—Ray Strack, Retired Special Agent, Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement

Help ensure that local police can stay focused on keeping our communities safe.

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 105

(This information furnished by Cristina Marquez, Not Safe. Not Just. Not Oregon. No on Measure 105.)

Argument in Opposition

Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon

&

Oregon Coalition of Christian Voices

Urge a NO VOTE on Measure 105

When a foreigner resides among you in your land, do not mistreat them.

The foreigner residing among you must be treated as your native-born.

Love them as yourself, for you were foreigners in Egypt.

Leviticus 19:33-34

As faith leaders from across Oregon and across faith traditions, we strongly urge a **NO VOTE on Measure 105**.

How we treat the marginalized in our society speaks volumes about our commitment to the Great Commandment, "to love our neighbor as we love ourselves." Since the 1970s, Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon has been resettling refugees and providing services for refugees and immigrants, inspired by God's call to welcome the stranger.

Today, we stand with all of our neighbors, including immigrants without documentation. They are our friends, co-workers, and family members. Our fellow Oregonians are caught in an unjust and broken immigration system. Faith communities will not be silent -- Measure 105 could open the door to serious civil rights violations, waste local law enforcement dollars and tear families apart.

Measure 105 would throw out a 30-year-old state law passed with near-unanimous Republican and Democratic support. Our "sanctuary" law is based in a proud faith tradition of dignity and fairness. It protects Oregonians from racial profiling, and prevents local police personnel, funds, equipment and facilities from being used to pursue and detain people suspected only of violating federal immigration law. Preserving this law means protecting Oregon values and priorities.

We urge a NO VOTE on Measure 105.

Find EMO's positions on other 2018 ballot measures at www.emoregon.org

EMO brings together diverse communities of faith to learn, serve and advocate for justice, peace and the integrity of creation.

OCCV (occv.org) advocates for public policies and laws in Oregon that we believe reflect God's desire for a government structure that promotes the well-being of all, and particularly the marginalized in our society.

(This information furnished by Britt Conroy, Public Policy Director, Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

ACLU of Oregon: No on Measure 105

For nearly 100 years, the American Civil Liberties Union has fought for the fair treatment of all people in our country. On behalf of over 50,000 members and supporters in Oregon, we work in the courts, in the legislature, and in communities to protect and advance civil rights and civil liberties.

Vote No on Measure 105 to keep in place an important Oregon law that works well.

What is often called our "sanctuary law" was passed with overwhelming bipartisan support of state Republicans and Democrats 31 years ago to ensure that Oregon police personnel, funds, equipment, and facilities are not used to pursue and detain people based only on the color of their skin or accent.

Vote No on Measure 105 to keep our local and state police focused on preventing and solving crimes in our local communities.

The law protects against unfair targeting, interrogating, and detaining of Oregonians just because police think they are unauthorized immigrants. The law has been working as intended to keep local law enforcement focused on solving local crimes and keeping our communities safe.

Vote No on Measure 105 because eliminating this law could result in serious civil rights violations and unjust racial profiling in our state.

Getting rid of the law would pave the way for Oregon to become a "show me your papers" state, where people are more often stopped and harassed based on the color of their skin. Removing this important protection could invite rampant racial profiling against Latinos, Asian Americans, and others presumed to be "foreign" based simply on how they look or sound.

The ACLU of Oregon is nonprofit and nonpartisan. We do not receive any government funding. Member dues as well as contributions and grants from private foundations and individuals pay for the work we do.

(This information furnished by David Rogers, Executive Director, ACLU of Oregon.)



Measure arguments 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.

for more information about
voting in Oregon

 **oregonvotes.gov**



1 866 673 8683

se habla español

TTY 1 800 735 2900

for the hearing impaired

Proposed by initiative petition to be voted on at the General Election, November 6, 2018.

Measure No.

106

Amends Constitution: Prohibits spending "public funds" (defined) directly/indirectly for "abortion" (defined); exceptions; reduces abortion access

Estimate of Financial Impact	118
Text of Measure	119
Explanatory Statement	119
Arguments in Favor	120
Arguments in Opposition	128

Ballot Title Caption

Amends Constitution: Prohibits spending "public funds" (defined) directly/indirectly for "abortion" (defined); exceptions; reduces abortion access

Result of "Yes" Vote

"Yes" vote amends constitution, prohibits spending "public funds" (defined) directly/indirectly for any "abortion" (defined), health plans/insurance covering "abortion"; limited exceptions; reduces abortion access.

Result of "No" Vote

"No" vote retains current law that places no restrictions on spending public funds for abortion or health plans covering abortion when approved by medical professional.

Summary

Amends Constitution. Under current law, abortions may be obtained, when approved by medical professional, under state-funded health plans or under health insurance procured by or through public employer or other public service. Measure amends constitution to prohibit spending "public funds" (defined) for "abortion" (defined) or health benefit plans that cover "abortion." Measure defines "abortion," in part, as "purposeful termination of a clinically diagnosed pregnancy." Exception for ectopic pregnancy and for pregnant woman in danger of death due to her physical condition. Exception for spending required by federal law, if requirement is "found to be constitutional." No exception for pregnancies resulting from rape/incest unless federal law requires. Effect on spending by public entities other than state unclear. Measure reduces access to abortion. Other provisions

Estimate of Financial Impact

Ballot Measure 106 amends the Oregon Constitution by prohibiting the expenditure of public funds on abortions, except for those deemed to be medically necessary, required by the federal government, or to terminate a clinically diagnosed ectopic pregnancy.

The financial impact of the measure is anticipated to result in a net annual expenditure increase of \$19.3 million in public funds administered by state government. This increase is based on two factors: 1) an estimated decrease in state government expenditures of \$2.9 million resulting from the prohibition on spending public funds for abortions not exempted under the measure; and 2) an estimated increase of \$22.2 million in state government expenditures resulting from an estimated increase in births and corresponding utilization of health care, food, and nutrition services provided by state government programs. The net expenditure increase of \$19.3 million represents the estimated impact for the first year of the measure and would be a recurring expense each year thereafter at a level dependent on program caseloads and cost of providing services.

The net financial impact on state funds is expected to be a cost of \$4.8 million in the first year and will compound in future years. The future compounded costs are indeterminate.

The measure is also expected to increase annual federal matching funds received by state government by an estimated \$14.5 million to support the additional health care, food, and nutrition services. As with the estimated net increase in state government expenditures, the increase in federal revenue represents the estimated impact during the first year of the measure and would recur each year thereafter at a level dependent on program caseloads and cost of providing state government services.

The financial impact on local government is indeterminate.

Committee Members:

Secretary of State Dennis Richardson
State Treasurer Tobias Read
Katy Coba, Director, Department of Administrative Services
Nia Ray, Director, Department of Revenue
Debra Grabler, Local Government Representative

(The estimate of financial impact was provided by the above committee pursuant to ORS 250.127.)

Text of Measure

The People of Oregon hereby amend the Oregon Constitution by adding the following:

Section 1. Prohibition on public funding for abortions.

The state shall not spend public funds for any abortion, except when medically necessary or as may be required by federal law.

Section 2. Definitions.

As used in this Article:

(1) **"Public funds" means funds and moneys under the control or in the custody of the State of Oregon or any of its political subdivisions or public officials.**

(2) **"Abortion" means the purposeful termination of a clinically diagnosed pregnancy of a woman resulting in the death of the human embryo or fetus.**

(3) **"Medically necessary" means a condition in which a licensed physician determines that the pregnant woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would place her in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.**

Section 3. Exceptions.

(1) **Public funds may be spent to pay for an abortion when federal law requires states to provide funding for abortions, such as in circumstances including rape or incest, in which case this Article shall be applied consistent with federal law to the extent the federal requirement is found to be constitutional.**

(2) **Public funds may be spent to pay for the termination of a clinically diagnosed ectopic pregnancy.**

Section 4. Other provisions.

Nothing in this Article shall be construed as prohibiting the expenditure of public funds to pay for health insurance as long as such funds are not spent to pay or reimburse for the costs of performing abortions.

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

Explanatory Statement

Currently women in Oregon may obtain abortions when approved by a medical professional, under publicly-funded health plans.

Ballot Measure 106 amends the Oregon Constitution to prohibit publicly-funded healthcare programs, including the Oregon Health Plan and the Public Employees Benefit Board, from covering abortion. It does so by prohibiting the spending of "public funds" (defined in the measure as "funds and moneys under the control or in the custody of the State of Oregon or any of its political subdivisions or public officials") for any "abortion," (defined in the measure as a "purposeful termination of a clinically diagnosed pregnancy of a woman resulting in the death of the human embryo or fetus") except for when that abortion is "medically necessary" (defined in the measure as "a condition in which a licensed physician determines that the pregnant woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would place her in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself") or when the spending of public funds on an abortion is required by federal law.

The measure creates two exceptions to the prohibition on spending of public funds for purposes of abortion. When federal law requires a state to provide funding for particular abortions, the first exception allows public funds to be spent on those abortions to the extent that the federal requirement is found to be constitutional. The second exception allows public funds to be spent on an abortion to terminate an ectopic pregnancy.

The measure states that it does not prohibit the expenditure of public funds for the purpose of health insurance costs, so long as public funds are not spent to pay or reimburse for the costs incurred in performing an abortion.

Committee Members:

Patrick De Klotz
Rebekah Millard
Margaret Olney
Laurel Swerdlow
Edwin Peterson

Appointed by:

Chief Petitioners
Chief Petitioners
Secretary of State
Secretary of State
Members of the Committee

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

Argument in Favor

Every Oregonian now participates in paying for abortions, for any pregnant woman who wants one, through our tax dollars. Oregon is one of only five states where a pregnancy may be terminated through all nine months, for any reason whatsoever. We are one of 17 states that allow Medicaid funds to directly pay for abortions. We rank LAST in abortion regulations.

In 1973, Roe V. Wade legalized abortion but allowed for restrictions after viability. Age of viability varies, but is approximately 25 weeks. Unlike many other states, in Oregon a baby may legally be killed in the womb up to the day of birth.

Pro-choice Oregonians believe abortion is morally permissible because the fetus is not yet a "person." But many of them still oppose late term abortions, abortions for the "wrong" sex, or for disability.

Other Oregonians are pro-life. Since "person" is not a scientific concept but a philosophical one, they think that just being human should qualify everyone as a "person" worthy of protection, without having to meet a subjective additional standard (the mere definition of which is hotly debated by philosophers). They prefer objective science: biologically, fertilization creates a new human being. The only difference between a zygote and a newborn is size and level of development.

Though Oregonians are deeply divided on the subject of abortion, most agree that taxpayers should not be forced to pay for elective abortions (not medically necessary). In the last fiscal year taxpayers spent more than \$1.7 million for 3,556 abortions, and during the past 14 years, Oregonians have paid almost \$24 million for 52,438 abortions.

This measure will protect women's health by allowing payment for medically necessary abortions (such as ectopic pregnancy). It will not prevent anyone from choosing abortion; it only relieves taxpayers of the obligation to pay for abortions that are medically unnecessary. Taxpayers should not be required to pay for elective abortions. Please vote yes.

Lynn Barton

Bette Strouth

(This information furnished by Lynn V Barton.)

Argument in Favor

My story: Why I'm voting YES on Measure 106

At the age of 18, I made a decision that sent me and the relationship with my fiancé into a life-altering and destructive direction. Misinformed and misguided by abortion providers in Oregon, we chose to have an abortion. My fiancé and I married several months later, but we struggled in silence for more than two decades. We knew something was wrong, but no one was talking at the time about abortion's impact.

Scientific research now demonstrates the risks, complications, and causal links of abortion on a woman's lifelong health, including her relationships. So why would we as a society so foolishly believe the false narratives that there are no negative effects of abortion on a woman's emotions, fertility, or overall wholeness? Ignoring the profound, and science-based, nature of a woman's unique and profound fertility, and abortion's greater impact, has become a political chess match.

I could no longer sit back, remain silent and allow the abortion industry cover-ups to go unchallenged. Since my own recovery process, I've spent the better part of the last fifteen years walking alongside countless women, couples, men and families who have been deeply impacted by the decision to end the lives of their children through abortion.

S.M.A.R.T. (Science Matters in Abortion Related Trauma) Women's Healthcare was birthed out of a passion for the truth, caring for the innocent and defenseless, challenging the cultural status quo that devalues human life, and a woman's all-encompassing health.

What will our legacy be to future generations? How do we view the innocent, the defenseless, our young? We must stop the forced funding of abortion on taxpayers for the sake of Oregon's women and future generations. We must stop ignoring the risk factors.

Help protect women from the risks, complications and causal links stemming from abortion by voting YES on Measure 106. A vote for Measure 106 is a vote for women's health and wholeness.

(This information furnished by Deborah L Tilden, Women for Measure 106, www.WomenVoteYes.org.)

Argument in Favor

Vote YES on Measure 106 to Save Lives

Measure 106 will save lives by ending taxpayer funding of abortions and freeing these tax dollars to serve Oregonians instead.

Oregon is one of only 17 states that uses tax dollars to fund abortions. **Nearly half of all abortions in Oregon are paid for by taxpayers.** Last year, pro-abortion politicians worked with the abortion lobby to further increase this funding. Voting yes on Measure 106 is an opportunity to correct a wrong perpetrated by Oregon's political elite.

Oregon is the **only** state with absolutely no restrictions on abortion. Abortion is legal until birth in Oregon. This means **taxpayers are funding horrifically painful late-term abortions.** Late-term abortions have been medically proven to cause the unborn child pain as he or she is slowly removed from the mother limb by limb. This terrible practice is legal and the abortionists are well paid by the taxpayers.

This system of taxpayer funded, late-term abortions props up the abortion industry. As more tax dollars are being spent on abortions, more money goes to the abortion industry that in turn supports pro-abortion politicians. As a result, **our government has effectively put a price on unborn lives** under the guise of "providing healthcare to Oregonians."

Measure 106 recognizes that abortion is not health care. It correctly prioritizes our state's budget by putting the actual health care needs of Oregonians before funding the abortion industry.

Measure 106 will save lives. We urge you to vote YES.

SOURCES: Guttmacher Institute; Oregon Adopted Budget; Oregon Vital Statistics; <https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/>; Roland Brusseau, *Developing Consciousness: Fetal Anesthesia and Analgesia*; <https://secure.sos.state.or.us/orestar>.

Learn more at www.ortl.org.

(This information furnished by Lois Anderson, Executive Director, Oregon Right to Life PAC.)

Argument in Favor

My story: Why I'm voting YES on Measure 106

What did taxpayer-funded abortion do for me? At 23, it made something too easy that should have been hard.

If I would have had to pay for my own abortion, I would not have done it. I would have sought other help with my first unplanned pregnancy. I would have experienced the amazing miracle of pregnancy, childbirth and motherhood sooner, and after having my first baby, I never would have had two more abortions.

If I hadn't had a taxpayer-funded abortion, I would never have experienced the deep, unending pain that comes with terminating a pregnancy. I would never have understood why "choice" is a lie. I never felt like I had a choice. I believed the lie that because of my temporary situation, I HAD to have an abortion.

Abortion is a permanent solution to a temporary problem, and because it was "free," there was nothing to slow me down or force me to consider future consequences. No one challenged me to investigate how abortion could impact me later. I did the "easy" thing that turned out to be the hardest.

Physically, I suffered a premature hysterectomy because of pre-cancer growing on the scar tissue caused by my abortions. Mentally, I spent years doubting I even deserved to have children. Emotionally, even after much counseling, a strong spiritual life, and the forgiveness of God and myself, I still carry deep sorrow and loss.

Every day I miss my children, who never got a chance for "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness". They endured excruciating pain, had all their potential and their very lives taken from them.

I realize now that "free" is never free. Someone always pays. For myself and the women of Oregon, "free" taxpayer-funded abortion simply costs too much.

Please join me in voting YES for Measure 106.

(This information furnished by Jo L Blossom, Women for Measure 106, www.WomenVoteYes.org.)

Argument in Favor

My story: Why I'm voting YES on Measure 106

I was born in Oregon, raised in an idyllic world far from the concerns of pregnancy and abortion. So when I found myself pregnant in my late teens, my world reeled. With the legalization of abortion, I was convinced there were no consequences from this procedure, that I would be okay.

After two abortions, I began to suffer with eating disorders, body image issues, depression, and relationship detachment. I didn't know what was wrong with me, but I certainly wasn't "okay." Remaining in denial, I was silent for 30 years, but eventually there were too many issues to ignore. Abortion had hurt me.

When I finally connected the dots, I began my healing process through an abortion recovery group, but I will never fully recover from this choice. I now live with lifelong emotional and physical consequences from Hashimoto's, an autoimmune disease which science has linked to abortion.

State-funded abortions have set a dangerous precedence in Oregon. We are sending the message that abortion is a healthy choice, but abortion is not healthcare. Science, statistics and women's testimonies have demonstrated its traumatic results. More than eighty percent of post-abortive women regret their decision. How many would be spared this regret if tax dollars were no longer used to fund abortions, giving women more time to understand the impact of their options?

I now work with women who are choosing whether or not to abort. I am committed to making sure each client is fully educated on parenting, adoption, and abortion so they can make an informed, life-defining decision.

Your yes vote on Measure 106 doesn't take away a woman's right-to-choose. It protects women from making a split second decision at the most vulnerable time in her life. It gives a woman the opportunity to consider her options and make an educated choice.

Women in Oregon deserve better care. They deserve your YES vote on Measure 106.

(This information furnished by Eileen Fahlgren, Executive Director, Pregnancy Resource Centers of Central Oregon.)

Argument in Favor

My story: Why I'm voting YES on Measure 106

Almost 40 years ago my mother took me to our family gynecologist to have my child aborted. My mom wanted the very best for me and thought my life would be ruined if I had a child at 15. She never thought there would be any psychological side effects from the abortion.

My abortion wasn't mentioned again in my family until I was in my mid-30s and found myself trying to come to grips with my tattered life. By this time I was on my fifth marriage, taking two different antidepressants each day, and living a life of promiscuity and alcohol abuse. I was about to leave my current husband when I made an appointment with our priest in Beaverton, Oregon. After confessing my abortion, among other sins, I realized I was suffering more than I let on about the abortion. I cried harder than I have ever cried as the shame, guilt and sadness I had been feeling for the past 20 years came to the surface.

There is a hole in my heart that will never fully heal. Yes, I am forgiven and I know this but my choice has had consequences that affected my entire family. I've had to learn to live with the fact that I did not get to meet my little one. I did not see her grow up, get married or have her own children. This was my choice, and I suffer the consequences each and every day.

My mom also suffered and apologized many times to me before she died. She asked me to forgive her for ruining my life. After experiencing what abortion does to women, men and their families firsthand, I would never want anyone to have an abortion or be forced to pay for someone else's abortion.

Please STOP taxpayer-funded abortion! Vote YES on Measure 106!

(This information furnished by Tamra A Johnson, Women for Measure 106, www.WomenVoteYes.org.)

Argument in Favor

Pro-Choice Oregonian for Measure 106

I am pro-choice, pro-responsibility, pro-Oregon, pro-women, and pro-men. I believe in being accountable and responsible for our actions and words. I don't necessarily like abortion (I wouldn't choose one myself), but I also don't believe I have the right to tell someone else what to do. You can have an abortion if you wish, just don't tell me to pay for it.

I know there are many moderate voters like me (those who tend to be somewhere in the middle on the abortion issue) who support Measure 106. I can't speak for everyone, but the way I see it is this: Measure 106 expands the personal freedoms we as Oregonians value. I don't want to pay for someone else's abortion, but under state law that's a freedom I currently don't have.

Having personal freedoms and individual rights are one thing — but asking YOU to fund MY rights is a totally different story.

Take the 2nd Amendment, which guarantees every American citizen the *right* to bear arms. This means we all have the *freedom of choice* when it comes to gun ownership. But it doesn't mean the government should reach into *your* pocket to buy *my* guns and ammo! That would be crazy, right? It's exactly the same with elective abortions.

Abortion is a personal choice that a woman has to make for herself. I don't make choices like that for other people. But, when a woman makes the choice to have an abortion, that woman can pay for it herself. Do I have a choice in this matter? YES, I choose to support Measure 106. **I choose to vote YES on Measure 106.**

— Angie Hummell, Oregon taxpayer, Hermiston OR

(This information furnished by Angie Hummell.)

Argument in Favor

My story: Why I'm voting YES on Measure 106

My life was shattered by shame. The day of my abortion, the admitting clerk checked me in at a hospital in Portland and asked me to sign a permission form to dispose of the fetus. Until then I'd never heard the word fetus. This growth inside me was a "mass of cells, undeveloped tissue", not an unborn child. In that moment, I realized I was signing the death certificate for my child. In my shame, I chose my life over his.

Years later I saw pictures of an unborn child, and I finally realized the truth about abortion. No woman wants to admit she killed her own children so I led a double life—fine on the outside, fearful on the inside. I feared I could never be trusted to be a mother and so I never had children. A professional by day, I used drugs and alcohol to relieve my pain at night, terrified others would learn my secret and I would lose everything—my family, my friends, my business, my church.

I am an Oregon taxpayer, and to protect other women and children, I'm no longer afraid to tell my story. Abortion devastated me, and it will do the same to others. My taxes should help women with adoption or assistance to keep their children safe, not abort them.

Please stop making it easy to erase an entire generation, genocide of the unborn children. Fund education, assistance, and help for women to find other options, but stop funding abortions with taxpayer money.

VOTE YES ON MEASURE 106.

(This information furnished by Linda Burwell, Women for Measure 106, www.WomenVoteYes.org.)

Argument in Favor

My story: Why I'm voting YES on Measure 106

How would you feel if you discovered the state of Oregon had paid for your underage daughter or granddaughter to have an abortion, without your consent? I am that girl.

Underage abortion is legal in Oregon—and paid for by taxpayers. Abortions are damaging to a teen girl physically, emotionally, and spiritually.

I know...I was a teen who received an abortion from a clinic that de-humanized the baby inside of me and encouraged me to discard it. At the time I was doing well in school, played tennis, surfed, and was a healthy teen. After becoming sexually involved with my boyfriend, suspecting I was pregnant, I went to a clinic for a pregnancy test. When the results came back positive I was overcome by fear. They immediately suggested abortion; that it would be "free," and my parents would not need to know.

Pretending to stay overnight at a friend's house, I instead went to have the abortion. Afterwards, I became very depressed. Rather than play tennis, surf, and hang out with friends, I slept and cried. It was a dark time—and we know now that removing a baby through abortion creates an abnormal cascade of hormonal responses, contributing to depression.

My boyfriend begged me not to do it. I shut him out because the fear of telling my family that I was pregnant was worse than acknowledging his pain. All these years later I still cry when I think of the baby and how I hurt this young man who knew, better than I did at the time, that life is sacred to God, that the little life inside me was not a "blob of tissue" but already a human being.

I cannot take back what I did. What I can do is encourage the voters of Oregon to stop supporting abortion with our state tax dollars. **Please vote YES on Measure 106.**

(This information furnished by Susan Huntley, Women for Measure 106, www.WomenVoteYes.org.)

Argument in Favor

My story: Why I'm voting YES on Measure 106

I discovered I was pregnant at age 16. Initially I decided to keep the baby, but I was afraid to tell my parents. My boyfriend's mother didn't want her son to be responsible for a child so she suggested an abortion.

I resisted at first, but with great sadness I finally agreed to the abortion. My boyfriend's mother drove me to the appointment in Portland, and my boyfriend paid for it. Because of how far along I was, luminaria was placed in my cervix to cause it to expand. Then I returned the next day in anguish for the abortion.

After the procedure, I felt a temporary sense of relief which was quickly replaced with shame, guilt, deep sorrow, and regret. Stuffing all those emotions was the only way to cope until after I became a Christian and began my healing journey within a Bible study for women wounded by abortion.

Paying for someone to abort her unborn child is like handing a knife to a person contemplating suicide. Instead of paying for abortion, Oregonians need to offer compassion and care for pregnant women in crisis. We need to help women by offering solutions that will not harm them. Solutions that will empower them. True freedom is the power to choose to do what is right for all those involved in a difficult situation.

Abortion ends the lives of innocent babies and puts women at grave risk for emotional trauma including higher risk of suicide and addictions. Our taxpayer money should go to preserving and protecting life, not hurting women.

Serving as the director of a pregnancy resource clinic for thirteen years, I've met hundreds of women who have regretted choosing abortion. I have never met anyone who regretted choosing life.

Please end taxpayer-funded abortions by voting YES on Measure 106. Our women and families deserve better care.

(This information furnished by Caroline Butcher, Women for Measure 106, www.WomenVoteYes.org.)

Argument in Favor

My story: Why I'm voting YES on Measure 106

As a mother, wife, and native Oregonian, my heart is deeply grieved by what is happening in our state regarding abortion. Last August, when House Bill 3391 passed, I knew that I could no longer remain silent. It was finally time to share my story.

Despite being a child of divorce, I was raised in a loving Christian home with my dad, new mom, and three brothers. I attended Bible College, married, and as my husband and I served in full-time ministry together, we had a deep desire to have a family of our own.

Unfortunately, things did not unfold the way we'd hoped. You see, I was the victim of a coerced abortion at the age of 15. This dark secret was hidden deep within my soul, unaware of how the trauma from an abortion would affect me for years to come.

As an adult, I suffered for years from infertility and multiple miscarriages. Even after I gave birth to our miracle son, I battled postpartum depression and an inability to bond with our baby boy. My husband resigned from the ministry, and after fifteen years of marriage, we divorced. I started drinking heavily, and my unresolved sorrow led to a 13-year addiction to alcohol.

When I finally got sober, memories of my abortion began to surface. At first, it was extremely painful, but with counseling, I was able to face what had happened in 1978 and my husband and I remarried in 2012.

PTSD following an abortion is extremely common, yet rarely diagnosed. Because so much shame surrounds this issue, many women suffer for decades in silence. We need to speak up in opposition to something that causes death to an innocent life and traumatic stress to his or her mother.

Please join me in voting YES on Measure 106. A vote for this measure is a vote for the health of all women.

(This information furnished by Michelle Yates, Women for Measure 106, www.WomenVoteYes.org.)

Argument in Favor

My story: Why I'm voting YES on Measure 106

When I was seventeen, I became pregnant, but I had no desire to become a mother, and quite honestly, I was terrified of labor pain.

Because I was six months pregnant, my abortion took place at a Portland hospital. I was placed on a cot, alongside a dozen other young women, in a basement ward. There, we each received a saline injection in our abdomen to expel our unborn children.

I will never be able to forget the horrific sights and sounds burned into my mind that day. After a few hours of painful labor, we all began losing our babies. I felt a violent lurching sensation as the baby slid from my body and then I saw my child—a small, still huddled form covered in blood laying on the white sheet of my cot.

When I left the hospital, I determined to put this horrible episode behind me, never thinking about it again, never talking about it. I became pregnant again and decided to give my second baby up for adoption. I was in awe when I gave birth to a healthy baby boy, grateful that a childless couple wanted to care for him.

I wish my story ended there, but filled with shame, I aborted one more time. The Lord has forgiven me, but even after forty years, the weight of loss still feels unbearable at times. I think about who my children might have been, children that I lost to "choice". The hurt and sadness is so heavy that I still weep for those babies that I never knew.

Mother Teresa once said, "the greatest destroyer of love and peace is abortion." In Oregon, we require that taxpayers fund this destruction. We are paying for anguish, sorrow, and deep regret.

**Please vote YES on Measure 106
for compassionate care for Oregon's women.**

(This information furnished by Diane Meyer, Women for Measure 106, www.WomenVoteYes.org.)

Argument in Favor

Public School Teachers' Perspective on Measure 106

As school teachers we deal with facts, figures, and critical thinking every day with our students. It's a fact that in Oregon there are absolutely no restrictions on abortions. None. It's also a fact that Oregon has nearly the broadest freedom of speech clauses in the nation. **We care about freedom. We care about choice.**

We also care deeply about the outcome of Measure 106. **No matter what opponents may tell you, this measure doesn't change the fact that every woman can still have an elective abortion whenever she wants.** Measure 106 simply broadens "freedom of choice" in a very Oregonian way, allowing for every person who pays taxes to also have freedom, by not forcing them to pay for controversial, *elective* medical procedures.

As women and as teachers, we believe everyone should have the right to make healthcare decisions in private, as well as having the right to not pay for things we don't agree with. Measure 106 balances our individual rights to choose in a reasonable way.

If Measure 106 is approved by voters, public employees like us will still have access to abortion — at any time, for any reason. We just don't think our neighbors who pay taxes should be forced to pay for an elective medical procedure we might choose. **Freedom is freedom. Choice is choice. We all deserve both.**

Please join us in voting yes on Measure 106.

Kim Coleman, Lebanon Public Schools
Raquel Cope, Junction City School District
Molly Lawrence, Southern Oregon Education Service District
Anna Maloney, Woodburn School District
Stephanie Montgomery, Salem-Keizer Public Schools

(This information furnished by Stephanie Montgomery, Public School Teachers for Measure 106.)

Argument in Favor

Dear Oregon Voters,

Fifteen years ago my birth mother had a choice, and she chose to give me life. I would have chosen to live, of course, if I had the option, but I had no choice in whether or not she picked abortion or adoption.

My birth mother gave me a voice, and my adoptive parents gave me a family. They also encouraged me to use my voice to tell my story and stand up for people who can't fight for themselves.

When I found out that our state government decided that all women in Oregon can have free abortions for any reason, at any time during their pregnancy, it made me angry and sad. I spent two weeks this summer in Africa, helping care for orphans in Uganda. I want to spend my life helping children, not silencing them. And I don't want a portion of the money that I earn to pay for someone else to harm their baby.

We as Oregonians need to stand up for our next generation. My generation.

I'm not old enough yet to vote, but please stand up for all the young women in our state who don't have a voice. **Please vote YES on Measure 106!**

— Karlyn Dobson, age 15

(This information furnished by Melanie B Dobson, grateful mom. Women for Measure 106, www.WomenVoteYes.org.)

Argument in Favor

To those "undecideds" who will be thinking about this issue before making their decision on how to vote. Please consider these points:

1. The vast majority of Oregon's taxpayer funded abortions are a personal choice - convenience- not at all needed to save a mother's life. (Oregon Health Authority)
2. The measure does not restrict/ban abortion – it stops taxpayer funding as the title says. Women are free to find alternate sources of money (which there are) for their abortion.
3. Have you ever thought about what the abortion procedure is and does? Is abortion really the "health care" that those who are opposed to this measure claim that it is? By definition and common sense health care is the treatment of disease, illness, injury and other physical and mental impairment – is that what you believe abortion is?

4. This measure challenges the deep-state funding machine which legislators on both sides of the aisle are afraid to confront. Planned Parenthood received \$3.7 Million from Oregon taxpayers in 2013-15, making them one of the most powerful political voices in the state. (Legislative Fiscal Office) They are a major beneficiary of tax funding for abortions.

5. Many of us who support this measure do so because since 1985 we have been denied our choice NOT to pay for abortions with our tax money and it weighs heavily on our consciences (a violation of the Oregon Constitution Article I, Section 3).

Oregonians –We simply ask you to think about these things... don't blindly buy all the dire warnings, threats and accusations of the opposition. We believe, as you do, freedom of choice is a good thing, but why should personal choices – such as abortion – be paid for by your tax dollars?

There are so many positive things Oregon can do with tax money, but funding abortions isn't one of them. Do you really want to pay for someone's abortion?

Join me in voting YES on #106.

(This information furnished by Bryan R Platt.)

Argument in Favor

Declaración del folleto de votantes en español

¿Por qué votar SÍ a la medida 106? Aquí hay cinco razones.

1. **El aborto daña a las mujeres – física, emocional y espiritualmente.** El aborto electivo no es cuidado de la salud, y no debe ser financiado por nuestros impuestos. Las mujeres merecen algo mejor que los abortos "gratuitos". Merecen nuestro amor y apoyo para tomar decisiones de las que no se arrepentirán después.

2. **La vida es un regalo precioso.** Debemos respetar y proteger la vida humana, no utilizar nuestros dólares de impuestos para destruirla.

3. **El aborto es demasiado controvertido para nuestros dólares de impuestos.** No es justo exigir a todos los contribuyentes que financien un procedimiento polémico que no es médicamente necesario.

4. **El aborto es una elección personal.** Y las elecciones personales no deberían financiarse con dinero público. ¡Tu dinero, tu elección!

5. **La medida 106 no quita ninguna libertad.** Si alguien quiere un aborto, ella será libre de elegirlo por cualquier motivo. La Medida 106 simplemente otorga a los contribuyentes la libertad de no tener que pagar por ella.

Como contribuyente de Oregon, como miembro de la comunidad latina y como mujer, le insto a que vote SÍ en la Medida 106.

Dora Luz Sandoval, BSDH, CDHC
Mount Angel, Oregon

(This information furnished by Dora L Sandoval.)

Argument in Favor

My story: Why I'm voting YES on Measure 106

My journey as a post-abortive woman began as a newly-divorced single mom. I already had two daughters, and even though I had strong convictions against abortion, I was so blinded by my need to find love again that I couldn't allow child number three to get in the way.

Determined to live the life I'd always dreamed of, I selfishly became susceptible to the lie that my baby was an interference rather than a gift to be enjoyed and cherished. That the most caring decision for my family was to remove this child before he was born. I couldn't have been more wrong.

Since having my abortion, the painful regret of losing my baby has traumatized both me and my girls. Not only did I rob myself of having a son, I robbed them of having a brother. Their brother. The empty place in our family has disrupted the harmony and vitality of our lives in heartbreaking ways, a natural outcome when the gift of life is thrown away rather than honoring the place it was meant to fill.

Don't be fooled, fellow Oregonians. Abortion doesn't just hurt women. The aftermath hurts entire families. In the name of "convenience," it brings instability to our culture and community.

Abortion isn't about women's rights. It's about human rights. And it's time for taxpayers in Oregon to stop funding it.

If you want to be a voice for the voiceless and advocate for life and liberty as it was meant to be, VOTE YES ON MEASURE 106. A vote for Measure 106 is a vote to care for all women. And a vote for all women is a vote for the family.

(This information furnished by April S Aguirre, Women for Measure 106, www.WomenVoteYes.org.)

Argument in Favor

So you've probably seen stats and numbers. Taxpayer this or healthcare that. But what is this measure really about, and why should you care enough to vote one way or another? I don't know about you, but as a 24-year-old millennial, those are some questions that usually cross my mind on issues like this.

First off, if you are reading these fine print arguments in your voters' pamphlet, good for you. Obviously, you are either extremely bored or really low on reading material.

For those of us who pay taxes—I think that would cover most of us—this ballot measure is about what happens with our tax dollars; specifically, whether or not they are used to fund abortions in Oregon. So basically, this ballot measure is letting Oregon taxpayers decide whether or not they would like to continue to pay for thousands of elective abortions each year. Interestingly enough, the polls say that most Oregonians don't really care what happens on the abortion issue, just as long as they don't have to pay for it. And that's where you come in. You are already paying for it. On this topic, Richard Doerflinger says, "It's not 'pro-choice' to force others to fund a procedure to which they have fundamental objections." (Not surprisingly, a poll by Marist Institute for Public Opinion found that 45 percent of pro-choice Americans oppose taxpayer-funded abortion.) So while it might not be readily apparent, this measure is not deciding whether or not abortion is okay – but rather whether or not it is okay to tell someone they must fund something they fundamentally object to.

Now, I'm going to assume that as a ballot measure argument-reading person, you are probably starting to yawn or glaze over. So to make a short story long, vote yes on this measure to stop the funding, or... well, just vote yes.

Ethan Hill

(This information furnished by Ethan Hill.)

Argument in Favor

My story: Why I'm voting YES on Measure 106

I was almost nineteen when I heard the words, "You're pregnant." I thought this meant I needed to decide whether or not I wanted to become a mother, not realizing that I already was.

I chose abortion because well-meaning loved ones either encouraged it or offered no alternatives. I was ashamed and it was easy to believe the lies that what would be removed was simply a piece of tissue, that I could easily go on with my life, never looking back. This was not just my choice; it was the choice of a society who promoted abortion.

I did look back in the following years and desperately wished that I would have fought for my first child. The next sixteen years, I suffered from eating issues, nightmares, flashbacks, anger issues and the inability to trust anyone. I couldn't bond with the four children I birthed nor trust my parenting decisions.

My healing journey began when a woman stood up in my church and shared about her own abortion and the tremendous suffering that followed until she went to a post-abortion healing center. With similar counseling and compassion, I was slowly able to heal as well.

Recently I advocated for a mentally ill Portland woman who was being coerced by local agencies to have a taxpayer-funded abortion. This woman—all women—with an unexpected pregnancy deserve better. She ultimately chose adoption.

I urge Oregon voters to no longer be silent about the suffering caused by abortion. I urge you to stop taxpayer-funded abortions in our state so fewer women will experience this heartache and trauma.

I have a son named Adam who would be 38 years old now. And how I wish he were here.

Help stop this coercion of women by voting **YES on Measure 106**. A vote for Measure 106 is a vote for hope and healing. A vote that we will be silent no more.

(This information furnished by Cynthia R Brunk, Women for measure 106 www.WomenVoteYes.org.)

Argument in Favor

Medical Professionals' Perspective on Measure 106

Opponents of Measure 106 will tell you it restricts access to healthcare. **As doctors, nurses, and medical professionals, we are here to tell you this is not the case.** If you join us in voting yes on Measure 106, any Oregonian who wants an abortion will continue to have the freedom to choose that — at any time, and without any restrictions.

Measure 106 doesn't restrict freedom, it actually increases freedom. After all, we're Oregonians, and we believe in the freedom to make our own choices. You can choose to have an elective abortion, but today another Oregonian is being required to pay for that choice. That doesn't seem very fair to us. Measure 106 allows all Oregonians to stay true to their values by not forcing someone else to pay for another person's private choices.

As doctors and nurses, we know our first duty is to protect our patients' health. Measure 106 allows for funding abortions when needed to protect the mother. **This is a crucial distinction – abortions that are medically necessary will still be covered by state-funded healthcare, while those that are simply an elective procedure will no longer be.**

This is where we believe we've stepped out of the realm of "access to healthcare" and are now simply talking about elective surgeries. **Paying for someone's life-saving medical procedure is one thing, paying for someone's lifestyle choice is another.**

Oregonians understand choice, and we each deserve the dignity of making choices about our lives and healthcare. Measure 106 is about increasing choice. **Please join us in voting yes.**

Mary C. Brainerd, RN BSN
Christine A. Cieslak, RN
Paul R. Cieslak, MD
Marianne Franklin, RN BSN
Emily Kohler, RN BSN
Christina Rummel, FNP
Tobin Rummel, DO
William L. Toffler, MD
Bethany Weaver, RN

(This information furnished by Bethany Weaver, Medical Professionals for Measure 106.)

Argument in Favor

Vote YES on Measure 106

As an Oregonian, are you aware that money you pay in taxes is used to pay for elective abortions? It's true. Oregon taxpayers fund ten abortions every day through the Oregon Health Plan.

Should elective abortions be paid for with taxpayer money? Should late-term abortions, when the baby is fully formed, be funded with public money? Should sex-selective abortions – abortions chosen because the baby is an undesired girl and not a boy – be paid for by Oregon taxpayers? We don't think so. And most Americans agree. The majority of Americans, including many who are pro-choice, oppose using tax dollars to pay for elective abortions.

Thirty-two states and the District of Columbia prohibit the use of public funds for abortion. Oregon can join them by voting YES on Measure 106.

Voting YES on Measure 106 will not stop all taxpayer money from funding abortions, but it will limit the use of public money for abortions. Measure 106 will prohibit the state from using taxpayer dollars to fund elective abortions.

Oregon taxpayers should not be forced to fund late-term and sex-selective abortions.

Vote YES on 106 to limit taxpayer funding of late-term abortions. Vote YES on 106 to limit taxpayer funding of sex-selective abortions. Vote YES on 106 to limit taxpayer funding of elective abortions.

Please join the Oregon Catholic Conference in voting YES on Measure 106.

The Oregon Catholic Conference – YES on 106

(This information furnished by Todd Cooper, Representative.)

Argument in Favor

We write to urge every voter to **vote YES** on this measure, a constitutional amendment to end taxpayer funding for abortion.

Abortion is unhealthy at every level. Lives are broken, traumatized. The harms of abortion extend beyond terminated babies and include women being rendered infertile or dying in the process. They, and the might-have-been-fathers, deal with shame or guilt later. Grandparents, siblings, also adoptive families, suffer losses.

Hope and dreams die with the aborted children. They may have become teachers, doctors, lawyers, farmers, inventors, mechanics, legislators, etc. but never had a chance. We never got to enjoy their achievements; their discoveries, or savor their being. Our taxes should be used for life, not death.

Endorsing abortion signals that one person's life is more valuable than another person's life, but as a nation we hold to the value of every life. Those under 45, born since "Roe", know that millions of their peers were not valued; considered to be inconvenient, unwanted, unworthy of life itself. How sad! And that in Oregon we are using tax money to do this is especially grievous!

We know that an unplanned pregnancy can be scary but there are many resources. True healthcare facilities outnumber abortion types 13-to-one in Oregon. Pregnancy Resource Centers offer help and mentoring throughout pregnancy and after birth. Valuing life begins with saying, "No more of my tax dollars for abortion." Let's invest in the support of mothers and their children! And many other great things that can be accomplished with your/our tax dollars.

Apart from how you decide to vote, please know that if you—or someone you know—deals with abortion related trauma, healing and forgiveness is available through Jesus Christ. This goes beyond the ballot box. Turn to a friend of faith, find a church, or go to your local pregnancy resource center for help.

Robin Lee
Marilee Apperson
Sue Schneider
Perry Atkinson

(This information furnished by Robin B Lee.)

Argument in Favor

My story: Why I'm voting YES on Measure 106

My parents divorced when I was thirteen and I fed into the lie that having a physical relationship with a boy would make me feel loved. After becoming pregnant at fourteen, my boyfriend's sister dropped me off at a Portland abortion facility. I was terrified to have an abortion, but the staff didn't educate me on any other options. I remember the terrible vacuum sound that day, then the pain and feeling both numb and alone afterwards.

Bulimia controlled my high school years. Then, after getting married and having three daughters, I became overwhelmed by depression and anxiety. Not being able to grieve the loss of my unborn child was like an infection to the relationships that mattered most to me—my husband and children.

After twenty years of struggling, I was introduced to a relationship with Jesus and accepted his forgiveness for my mistakes. Later I participated in a post-abortion healing program through my local pregnancy clinic and was finally able to grieve the loss of my child.

Through some caring and compassionate people, I have experienced God's amazing grace in a very personal way and the silence and pain of my abortion no longer haunt me. I still grieve at unexpected times, but because of my faith, I have an eternal hope of heaven and know my God redeems.

Sharing my story now is a privilege and allows me to continue healing and hopefully make a life-impacting difference for the future of women and their children. All women, their choices and their health, are important. This includes each tiny and vulnerable girl still growing in her mother's womb.

Voting YES on Measure 106 is an opportunity for us to be a voice for the voiceless. May the people of Oregon seek mercy and value all human life by voting **YES on Measure 106** to stop our tax dollars from funding abortions.

(This information furnished by Tina M Fortin, Women for Measure 106, www.WomenVoteYes.org.)

Argument in Favor

The High Cost of Free Abortions

Did you know there are no state laws that restrict abortion in Oregon in any way, despite **overwhelming public support for at least some limits on abortion?**

On top of this, over the past 16 years Oregon taxpayers have unknowingly spent more than \$24 million on "free" abortions covered by the Oregon Health Plan. Below is data directly from the Oregon Health Authority:

Fiscal year	Abortions	Taxpayer cost
2002-03	4,105	\$1,889,745
2003-04	4,126	\$1,676,068
2004-05	3,950	\$1,486,187
2005-06	4,064	\$1,563,232
2006-07	3,527	\$1,447,982
2007-08	3,446	\$1,520,986
2008-09	3,367	\$1,525,216
2009-10	3,537	\$1,655,184
2010-11	3,704	\$1,762,620
2011-12	3,780	\$1,717,292
2012-13	3,760	\$1,728,516
2013-14	3,547	\$1,768,417
2014-15	3,846	\$1,870,232
2015-16	4,181	\$2,500,182
2016-17	4,086	\$2,252,374
2017-18	3,593	\$1,928,341
16-year total:	57,026	\$24,474,488

More than 57,000 lives have been cut short because of "free" abortions. An entire generation of future teachers, firefighters, business owners — and taxpayers — have been lost.

They Took Away Our Voice

Last summer, Gov. Kate Brown held a celebration signing ceremony for House Bill 3391 — a multi-million dollar law to further increase taxpayer funding for abortion. **Incredibly, sponsoring legislators declared the bill to be an emergency, preventing citizens from referring the law to the public for a vote.**

Here's what state law requires today:

1. **Oregon taxpayers must fund abortion at all stages of pregnancy, even late-term abortions** when the baby is fully formed and perfectly healthy.
2. **Oregon taxpayers must fund abortion without limits or restrictions**, even when used repeatedly as a substitute for birth control.
3. **Oregon taxpayers must fund abortion for any reason**, even when used for gender selection to choose a boy over a girl.

Measure 106 is the only way we can stop our tax dollars from funding elective and late-term abortions. Lawmakers wouldn't allow you to have a say with HB 3391. But today you have a voice. I hope you will use this opportunity to **vote YES on Measure 106**.

(This information furnished by Jeff Jimerson, Yes on Measure 106. You can help stop taxpayer-funded abortion at www.yes106.org & [facebook.com/yes106](https://www.facebook.com/yes106).)

Argument in Favor

My story: Why I'm voting YES on Measure 106

The initial shock of my unplanned pregnancy at age 24 was coupled with insurmountable fear. Abortion was pressed upon me as the only answer by my boyfriend, so I made the appointment despite the frantic pleas of my conscience. The abortion clinic in McMinnville created a false sense of urgency and painted a drastic picture of my future if I didn't immediately terminate.

At the appointment, I asked to see the ultrasound image. I knew that if I saw the baby, the courage hiding deep within me would emerge, and I would be able to leave that horrible place. The doctor knew I was undecided about the procedure. Instead of showing me the live image, she showed me a still photo. Then she lied and said there was no heartbeat. She told me that I should consume RU-486 and save myself the pain of a miscarriage. My boyfriend believed her and urged me to go through with the procedure. I have never felt so alone or betrayed in my life.

I walked into an abortion facility a terrified pregnant woman, driven by an overwhelming fear, desperately wishing someone would tell me I was strong enough to be a mother. I walked out a destroyed, broken, shadow of the woman I had been. Nothing could have prepared me for the sense of hopelessness that came after I aborted my baby.

Nightmares began soon after my abortion. Horrific images of men and boys being murdered or lying drowned in a bathtub. I struggled with PTSD, anxiety, and depression. My abortion haunted me for years, and to this day, I have waves of grief for my lost child.

Women deserve so much better than this gross exploitation of emotion, intimidation, fear and marginalization. Abortion hurts women. Why should taxpayers pay to hurt our sisters, mothers, wives and daughters?

Please, join me in voting YES on Measure 106.

(This information furnished by Elizabeth Gillette, Women for Measure 106, www.WomenVoteYes.org.)

Argument in Favor

Why We Are Voting YES on Measure 106

Due to 4D ultrasound we are now able to see inside the womb as never before including a yawn or smile on a baby's face. The undeniable scientific fact is that what's present in the womb is a human being. This amazing creation is conceived with his/her unique DNA containing enough information to fill fifty sets of encyclopedias. Something nonhuman doesn't become human by growing bigger or older; whatever is human is human from the beginning.

We are pro-women, believing each woman should be respected and trusted with the truth about her unborn child. We need to offer them support and encouragement to give life to their child, and if they're not able to parent, to entrust them to one of over one million couples nationwide waiting to adopt. That's why Eternal Perspective Ministries financially supports various pro-life ministries that provide information, counseling, and physical provisions for women who find themselves in an unplanned pregnancy.

"Reproductive freedom" sounds like it would empower women, but there's no freedom in taking the life of another human being. We've heard from countless women who have been devastated by their decision to abort. We support those ministries who bring hope and healing to broken hearts. A vote for Measure 106 is a vote for ALL females, born and unborn!

It's time for Oregon taxpayers to stop funding abortion and join 38 other states who have fetal homicide laws in place, recognizing the personhood of an unborn child: <http://www.ncsl.org/research/health/fetal-homicide-state-laws.aspx>.

Please vote YES on Measure 106 so ALL women have a voice and a lifetime of choices!

(This information furnished by Randy Alcorn, Founder & Director, Eternal Perspective Ministries.)

Argument in Favor

Who's Behind Measure 106?

Oregon Life United, the grassroots organization behind Measure 106, exists because **we believe women with unplanned pregnancies deserve better than "free" abortions.**

Instead of using our tax dollars to fund unlimited elective abortions, we support efforts to provide healthcare and resources that respect both mother and child.

Currently, our state government discriminates against the most vulnerable Oregonians by providing **the most hopeless and cheapest means of support** by funding thousands of elective abortions annually and calling this "care." We are betraying and abandoning women in their time of greatest need. Better resources are available, but why aren't those resources championed?

Hope for a future, hope for recovery, hope for support should not be something only afforded to those who have. Women deserve real care when they are challenged by an unexpected pregnancy, not just an immediate free abortion to make their "problem" go away. **Because ending the life of your own child is not something that ever goes away.**

As the most controversial medical procedure in the world, we believe elective abortion should not be funded by taxpayers. *But abortion through all nine months of pregnancy is currently legal in Oregon and fully funded by our taxes, for any reason and without limits.*

A YES vote for Measure 106 communicates that as Oregonians we believe no matter where you live, how much money you make, or how old or able you are, your life matters and should be valued. Life is worth more!

10,000 volunteers from all 36 counties gathered more than 150,000 signatures to place Measure 106 on the ballot. As the chief petitioners of this measure, we want all Oregonians to have a choice in whether we continue funding elective abortions with our tax dollars.

Today you have a choice. **Please join us in voting YES to stop discriminating against the most vulnerable Oregonians.**

Suzanne Belatti, Portland

(This information furnished by Suzanne Belatti, Oregon Life United, www.OregonLifeUnited.org.)

Argument in Opposition

City Club of Portland Recommends a “NO” Vote on Measure 106

Lack of access to abortions harms low-income women and women of color. Policies that attempt to restrict funding for abortions do not reduce the number of abortions sought or obtained. However, these policies do make abortions less safe and contribute to the economic instability of low-income women.

City Club of Portland has examined this issue repeatedly—including in 2014 and 1978. **Oregonians are correct to continually reject policies like Measure 106.** In a 1978 City Club research report on a proposal similar to Measure 106, we concluded that “...passage of the Measure would create a disproportionate financial hardship and deny a legal medical procedure to [those] least able to afford such an impact.” Once again, City Club members have voted to affirm this research and analysis.

Why vote NO?

Measure 106 would set a dangerous precedent by allowing voters to make medical decisions.

This constitutional amendment is a dangerous and misguided attempt to legislate inequality. If passed, Measure 106 would most harm low-income women. More than 270,000 individuals who receive medical coverage through the Oregon Health Plan would see reductions in their healthcare coverage, including many women of color. In addition, 77,000 state employees would also experience health care cuts.

Women who are denied abortions are more likely to fall into poverty as a result.

Measure 106 is a poorly-conceived and unnecessary constitutional amendment that limits access to reproductive health care. Vote NO on Measure 106.

About City Club of Portland

Since 1916, City Club of Portland has conducted nonpartisan research for the benefit of all Oregonians. Today, we’re building on that legacy by bringing together a diverse community of thinkers and doers to spark change across our region.

For more information about City Club of Portland or to read our ballot measure reports, visit www.pdxcityclub.org, email info@pdxcityclub.org, or call 503-228-7231.

(This information furnished by City Club of Portland, Julia Meier, Executive Director.)

Argument in Opposition

Organizations you trust urge you to vote NO on Measure 106

Every Oregonian must be able to decide whether and when to become a parent—no matter how much money they make or how they are insured. The anti-abortion activists behind Measure 106 want to chip away at healthcare benefits and decrease coverage for reproductive health care for nearly 400,000 Oregonians, specifically targeting low-income Oregonians who already face significant barriers to receiving care.

The right to healthcare is the foundation of freedom and opportunity for women and their families. No one should be denied care because of how much they make or how they are insured.

Measure 106 sets a dangerous precedent by cherry-picking which medical procedures insurance can and can’t cover. That’s why over 35 organizations across Oregon are urging you to vote NO on Measure 106. For a full list of organizations opposed to Measure 106, visit NoCutsToCare.com/coalition.

The following groups urge a NO vote on Measure 106—because every Oregonian should have access to the full range of reproductive health care, from preventative care to postpartum care.

ACLU of Oregon
AFT-Oregon
American Association of University Women (AAUW) of Oregon
Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO)
Catholics for Choice
Causa
Children First for Oregon
Democratic Party of Oregon
Fair Shot For All Coalition
Family Forward Oregon
Forward Together
Health Care for All Oregon Action
Housing Oregon
Human Services Coalition of Oregon
Multnomah County Democrats
NARAL Pro-Choice Oregon
Northwest Abortion Access Fund
Oregon AFL-CIO
Oregon Center for Public Policy
Oregon Health Equity Alliance
Oregon Latino Health Coalition
Oregon Medical Association
Oregon NOW (National Organization of Women)
Oregon Nurses Association
Oregon Progressive Party
Oregon School-Based Health Alliance
Oregon School Employees Association
Oregon State Fire Fighters Council
Oregon Women’s Equity Coalition
Oregon Working Families Party
PCUN
Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon
Planned Parenthood Columbia Willamette
Planned Parenthood Southwestern Oregon
SEIU
The Bus Project
Tillamook County Democrats
Unite Oregon
Urban League of Portland
Western States Center

(This information furnished by Kimberly Koops-Wrabek, No Cuts to Care, No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

Don’t change the constitution: Vote NO on 106, 104 and 103

As a former Oregon Supreme Court Justice and a judge for over 40 years, I relied on our state constitution to protect your rights.

Now, Measures 106, 104 and 103 want to make pointless, risky and misleading changes to our state constitution. We should not change the constitution unless there is an urgent, major reason to do so.

106 would permanently amend the Oregon constitution and set a dangerous precedent by allowing special interests to decide which medical procedures insurance can or can’t cover, permanently restricting access to reproductive health-care for hundreds of thousands of vulnerable Oregonians

Measures 104 and 103 are equally dangerous:

104 is an unnecessary expansion of Oregon’s supermajority requirement that would extend far beyond protections for taxpayers: it will lead to legislative gridlock, likely forcing cuts on services like K-12 schools and Medicaid.

103 creates permanent tax loopholes for special interests that are not that urgent, vital or important. There is no amendment like Measure 103 in any state in the country. Measure 103 locks a series of complicated changes into our constitution. The authors of the bill, lobbyists that work in Salem, cannot agree on the impact of the measure. The Attorney General and the Oregon Supreme Court found a number of impacts of Measure 103 that the authors didn't intend, including provisions that make it impossible to lower taxes for food-related businesses, and rollbacks to healthcare funding for Oregon families.

While some research has been done into the impact of Measure 103, no one will know exactly what this measure does until years of court cases are resolved about its intent and impact.

As a judge, I can tell you that these changes to our constitution are pointless, risky, misleading and wrong.

Oregon's Constitution should not be a testing ground for special interest experimentation.

Join me in rejecting dangerous constitutional amendments. Vote No on 103, 104 and 106.

(This information furnished by Elisabeth Swarttouw, on behalf of Retired Supreme Court Judge Bill Riggs.)

Argument in Opposition

NO ON MEASURE 106 FOR OREGON'S WORKERS

Working people in Oregon deserve affordable and accessible health care.

We represent hundreds of thousands of hardworking Oregonians who have dedicated their lives to public service. We are teachers, firefighters, school employees, child welfare workers, home healthcare providers, hospital janitors, and state and county workers. We are the engine that keeps Oregon running. Measure 106 would interfere with our bargained benefits and set a dangerous precedent of cherry picking which health care services public employees can access.

That's why Oregon's unions and public employees oppose Measure 106.

Oregon State Fire Fighters Council (3,200 strong)

AFT-Oregon (13,000 strong)

Oregon Nurses Association (14,000 strong)

Oregon School Employees Association (21,000 strong)

Oregon AFSCME (28,000 strong)

SEIU (70,000 strong)

Oregon AFL-CIO (300,000 strong)

Voting NO on Measure 106 protects the full range of reproductive health care for vulnerable Oregonians.

Every Oregonian should have access to the full range of reproductive health care, starting with preventive care and continuing through postpartum care. 271,833 women of reproductive age receive health care through the Oregon Health Plan. Under Measure 106, these Oregonians will no longer have access to the care they need.

Voting NO on Measure 106 protects the full range of reproductive health care for Oregon's public workers.

This basic right is the foundation of freedom and opportunity for individuals and their families, and it's a right we fought hard for. According to the Department of Human Services and Oregon Health Authority, a total of 77,344 women of reproductive age are insured through the Public Employees' Benefit Board (PEBB) and Oregon Educators Benefits Board (OEBB) as of June 2018. Under Measure 106, Oregon's public servants will no longer have access to the full range of reproductive health care they need.

Vote NO on Measure 106, and stand with us to protect the full range of reproductive health care for vulnerable Oregonians and public employees.

(This information furnished by Elvyss Argueta, SEIU.)

Argument in Opposition

Catholics for Choice shapes and advances sexual and reproductive ethics that are based on justice, reflect a commitment to women's well-being and respect and affirm the capacity of women and men to make moral decisions about their lives. We serve as a **voice for the vast majority of Catholics across the United States—nearly half a million in Oregon—who support access to comprehensive reproductive health services** as a matter grounded in our Catholic faith and social justice tradition. **We oppose Measure 106.**

As Catholics, we are called by our faith to **listen to our conscience** and to **respect the right of others to do the same**. Catholics believe each person has the gift and responsibility to do what they believe is right, to follow their conscience first and last in all matters of moral decision making, including decisions about pregnancy. **Measure 106 would impede an individual's ability to follow what they know is best for them. It is unfair and unjust.**

Our social justice tradition compels us to advocate for the poor and marginalized, including those with limited options for healthcare services. As Catholics we are called to show solidarity with and compassion for our neighbors regardless of how much money they have or what they believe, that is **why we vehemently oppose Measure 106**. We believe no one should be denied access to critical reproductive healthcare, including abortion, simply because they are poor or rely on the state for their health insurance.

Government should not be in the business of making healthcare less accessible, promoting one religious viewpoint or imposing any one religious belief on all citizens. **Measure 106 is wrong for faith communities, wrong for the people of Oregon and at its base just plain wrong.**

We urge all Oregonians to Vote NO on Measure 106.

(This information furnished by Jon O'Brien, Catholics for Choice.)

Argument in Opposition

REPUBLICANS ARE VOTING NO ON MEASURE 106

Dear fellow Oregon voter,

As a lifelong Republican, I am appalled by the Trump-Pence administration's ongoing attacks on women and reproductive rights, and the attacks I see right here at home in Oregon. In Oregon, over 28,000 Republicans vote pro-choice. We believe every person should be able to decide for themselves whether and when to become a parent, with the council of their family, their faith, and their health care provider. **We should not amend our constitution to suit an individual's or organization's beliefs and interests. That's why we're voting NO on Measure 106.**

I love this great state, and I won't stand idly by while our neighbors and families are attacked by those who don't share our values. **As a traditional Republican, I believe in individual responsibility, personal freedom, and small government. That's why I am voting NO on Measure 106.**

Sincerely,

Darrell Dickenson

(This information furnished by Kimberly A Koops-Wrabek, No Cuts to Care, No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

**Protect our Constitution:
Vote No on Measures 106, 103, and 104**

*** We should only amend the constitution when there's an urgent reason ***

*** Constitutional amendments lock in flaws — and cannot be fixed ***

*** No other state has constitutional amendments like these ***

Measures 106, 103 and 104 erode protections, creating flaws and loopholes for special interests that will be nearly impossible to change.

These amendments are costly, flawed and pointless, but we can protect Oregon by voting No.

Measure 106 puts cuts to healthcare into Oregon's constitution:

- Cuts access to healthcare for low-income Oregonians and public employees.
- Sets a dangerous precedent by amending Oregon's constitution and allowing special interests to cherry pick which medical procedures insurance can and can't cover. This has never been done before.
- Takes away the full range of essential reproductive health care from teachers, firefighters, and hundreds of thousands of other Oregonians.

Measure 103 is a broad and sweeping constitutional change:

- It is retroactive, which means it rolls back existing services for Oregonians including healthcare for families. This cannot be changed.
- It is flawed and sloppy, banning taxes on certain items in such a nonsensical way that its own authors do not understand the impact. If it passes, expect years of litigation.
- It only helps special interests, creating winners and losers in Oregon's tax laws based on who can afford a high-powered lobbyist.

Measure 104 adds a new layer of bureaucracy and gridlock:

- It protects special interest tax breaks, making it harder to help Oregon families.
- It is pointless for us, but it helps a narrow few: the Constitution already requires a supermajority threshold for new taxes on Oregonians.
- Designed to protect oil and gas interests. This measure protects specific loopholes for specific industries.

Poorly drafted Constitutional Amendments like Measures 106, 103 and 104 are nearly impossible to change. Their flaws will be locked into our constitution.

Vote No on Measures 106, 103 and 104

(This information furnished by Thomas K Adamson, Vote No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

NO CUTS TO CARE: NO ON MEASURE 106

Every Oregonian should have access to the full range of reproductive health care, including preventative, abortion, and postpartum care. The basic right to health care is the foundation of freedom and opportunity for individuals and their families. Working families are under so much strain today and often have a hard time making ends meet. They need support like paid time off, affordable child care, and affordable, essential reproductive health care. Access to this kind of support helps Oregonians feel economically secure. This dangerous measure impacts hundreds of thousands of Oregonians, including individuals served by every one of our organizations.

Abortion is health care.

That's why we have come together to ask you to

VOTE NO on Measure 106.

ACLU of Oregon

Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO)

Forward Together

NARAL Pro-Choice Oregon

Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon

SEIU Local 503

Western States Center

Every Oregonian must be able to decide whether and when to become a parent—no matter how much money they make or how they are insured. Access to quality health care is necessary for all families to thrive. Our health should not depend on who we are, where we live or how much money we make. When individuals are healthier, families are healthier. When families are healthier, our communities are healthier. And when communities are healthier, Oregon is healthier.

WHO DOES MEASURE 106 HURT?

271,833

Oregon Health Plan Recipients

77,344

State Employees in Oregon

Vote NO on Measure 106 by November 6, 2018,

to ensure all Oregonians have access to the health care they need. For more information about our campaign to defend reproductive freedom, visit NoCutsToCare.com.

(This information furnished by Courtney Graham, No Cuts to Care, No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

We Can't Go Back to a Time Before Roe v. Wade:

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 106

I had an abortion at 16 years old, when I was a junior in high school. It was 1971, one and a half years before Roe v. Wade was passed. When I look back at the map showing abortion services pre-Roe v. Wade, I am filled with dread. I was incredibly fortunate to be close to one of four places in the country where abortion services were legal. Even in a lower middle-class family, the privilege I brought to the situation was vast. I had a job and friends with a car that ran well enough for the drive. I had access to phones and information about services. Even with these advantages time almost ran out. I look at the map and I am floored by the experiences of so many women who did not have my good fortune. Access to health care should not depend on what you have.

We cannot go back to a time when safe, accessible abortion wasn't a reality for most women. Because I had access to abortion, I was able to finish high school and went on to the University of Connecticut. Now, as a mother of two daughters, I instill a sense of self-dignity in my children, including the right to choose when to have sex, how to practice consent, and the right to choose whether and when to become a parent.

I want to urge my community to pay close attention to the uphill battle we may face if Measure 106 passes. We have become complacent in the face of 45 years of safe access. We need to rededicate ourselves to the fight for access to safe legal reproductive rights, and **we can start by voting NO on Measure 106.**

Terri P, Springfield

(This information furnished by Courtney Graham, No Cuts to Care, No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

-----Trust Oregonians: Vote NO on Measure 106-----

As an organization that works to make sure all families have the rights, recognition and resources they need to thrive, **Forward Together knows that Oregon families come in all shapes and sizes.** Our families are multi-generational, speak many languages, include immigrants, LGBTQ individuals, people of color, and more.

And we know that our families face similar struggles—whether its making ends meet, finding affordable housing, or around our healthcare. Our families make tough decisions every day—especially about healthcare.

Measure 106 would take away insurance coverage for abortion care for low-income Oregonians. It would take away healthcare from more than 270,000 Oregonians on the Oregon Health Plan, our state's Medicaid program.

Oregon's families of color are resilient and strong, yet we've had to overcome persistent economic and social barriers that disproportionately impact our communities. Our communities already face huge obstacles in accessing fundamental healthcare—whether its prenatal care, pregnancy, post-partum, or abortion care—because of distance, lack of translation services, or cost. **Measure 106 would create new roadblocks for communities of color in Oregon.**

Each of us must be able to decide whether and when to become a parent—regardless of how much money we make or how we're insured. Personal decisions about abortion should remain with Oregonians, their families and their medical providers, without government interference.

We trust Oregonians to make the right decision for themselves, whether that is to become pregnant or end a pregnancy. Once an Oregonian has made the decision to end a pregnancy, they should know that it will be covered by health insurance, just like any other medical procedure.

We urge you to vote NO on M106.

(This information furnished by Kalpana Krishnamurthy, Forward Together.)

Argument in Opposition

League of Women Voters of Oregon Urges a NO on Measure 106

The League of Women Voters of Oregon urges voters to oppose this measure, which will inequitably reduce access to health care for vulnerable Oregonians.

The League of Women Voters of Oregon (LWVOR) is a grassroots, nonpartisan political non-profit organization that encourages informed and active participation in government in order to build better communities statewide. Our legislative action committee and LWVOR Board analyzed Measure 106. **Measure 106 would be detrimental to the health and pocket-books of hundreds of thousands of Oregonians.**

Measure 106 denies Oregonians essential reproductive health care, the foundation of freedom for women and their families. No one should be denied care because of how much they make or how they are insured.

Oregon has a 40-year tradition of providing the full range of reproductive health care to all women. Working families are under so much strain today and often have a hard time making ends meet. They need support like paid time off, affordable childcare, and affordable, essential reproductive health care. Access to this kind of support helps women feel economically secure, and helps our economy thrive.

Oregon families and women will suffer if Measure 106 passes.

- An estimated 270,000 women of reproductive age receive health care through the Oregon Health Plan. Under Measure 106, these Oregonians will no longer have access to the full range of reproductive healthcare they need.
- **CBS News reported in 2017 that most Americans cannot afford an unexpected \$500 expense without going into debt.** (1) This is approximately the cost of an early-stage abortion. Studies show that a woman who is denied an abortion is more likely to fall into poverty than one who is able to get the care she needs.

The League believes access to essential reproductive health care is the foundation of freedom for women and their families. Vote no on Measure 106 to preserve this right.

(1) <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/most-americans-cant-afford-a-500-emergency-expense/>

(This information furnished by Norman Turrill, President, League of Women Voters of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

NO on Measure 106: For A Healthy and Thriving Rural Oregon

Rural and small-town Oregon is a vibrant part of our great state. The strength of rural Oregon depends on economic opportunity and job security. Every Oregonian should have access to the full range of reproductive health care, starting with preventive care and continuing through postpartum care.

Access to the full range of reproductive health services in rural Oregon ensures the vitality of our state.

Measure 106 would reduce access to health care, particularly for the most vulnerable people throughout the state, including many rural Oregonians.

In some rural counties, more than a third of families rely on Medicaid. Measure 106 would restrict access to reproductive healthcare for women and families on Medicaid, limiting economic opportunity and stability. Without the full range of healthcare services, families in our rural communities could face economic hardship or even bankruptcy.

The amount of money a person has should not prohibit them from receiving the medical attention they need.

Working families are under so much strain today, and often have a hard time making ends meet. When people are denied access to healthcare because they cannot pay for it, we all pay the price. Women and families experience greater educational and employment opportunities when they have access to the full range of reproductive health services.

Vote NO on Measure 106 to ensure all Oregonians have access to the healthcare they need to thrive.

Rural Oregon Progressives

SO Health-E

(This information furnished by An X Do, No Cuts to Care: No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

As a woman and a firefighter, I strongly oppose Measure 106 and urge you to VOTE NO by November 6

I have been a firefighter in Bend, Oregon for 18 years. As a first responder who works in stressful and dangerous situations every day, my health care is very important to me. I fought alongside my union and the Oregon State Fire Fighters Council for health care benefits that included the full range of reproductive health services.

Now, extremists are trying to take those benefits away from not only firefighters, but our state's teachers, nurses, and public servants, and people who are on Medicaid. Having the full range of reproductive health care is a right, not a privilege. Measure 106 interferes with my bargained benefits and sets a dangerous precedent of cherry picking which health care services public employees can access. No organization should be able to decide what part of my reproductive health care should be covered. Every Oregonian should have access to the full range of reproductive health care, starting with preventive care and continuing through postpartum care. I fought hard for my health care, and my reproductive health care is a vital and extremely important part of my benefits.

Please vote NO on Measure 106: It is discriminatory and degrading to the women who fight on Oregon's front lines every day.

Sincerely,

Patricia Connolly

(This information furnished by Kimberly A Koops-Wrabek, No Cuts to Care, No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon health care providers & advocacy groups strongly oppose Measure 106

Our health shouldn't depend on who we are, where we live or how much money we make. That's why doctors, nurses, health care providers, and health advocacy groups across the state are urging you to vote NO on Measure 106.

Every one of us has a basic right to health care, including access to the full range of reproductive services needed to thrive. We know first hand how deeply affected women and their families are without access to these critical health services.

Measure 106 cuts access to reproductive health care for nearly 400,000 Oregonians, including vulnerable Oregonians accessing health care through the Oregon Health Plan.

THAT'S WHY MEASURE 106 IS OPPOSED BY:

Health Care for All Oregon Action

Northwest Health Foundation

Oregon Health Equity Alliance

Oregon Latino Health Coalition

Oregon Medical Association

Oregon Nurses Association

Oregon Public Health Association

Oregon School-Based Health Alliance

When people have access to reliable, affordable reproductive health care, they and their families are healthier.

Please join us in voting NO ON MEASURE 106 to keep Oregon healthy.

(This information furnished by Laura A Nash, Northwest Health Foundation.)

Argument in Opposition

LOCAL BUSINESSES ARE VOTING NO ON MEASURE 106

As Oregon Business owners, we believe access to healthcare - including reproductive health care - is vital to our community. Healthcare is a right, not just a privilege for the fortunate few.

This is a value we hold as Oregonians, but it is also a basic economic tenet that when everyone can care for themselves and for their families, they are happier and more productive at home and in the workplace. Furthermore, when Oregonians are unable to access the healthcare they need, we all pay the price.

Every Oregonian should have access to the full range of reproductive health care, starting with preventive care and continuing through postpartum care—including abortion. Once someone has made the decision to end a pregnancy, they should have medically-accurate information and know it will be covered by health insurance, just like any other medical procedure. A person should be able to end a pregnancy without pressure or any additional burdens, because abortion is health care.

If Measure 106 passes, it would take away critical care from hundreds of thousands of low-income Oregonians, a cost that will be felt by all of us. Barriers to accessing reproductive health care can jeopardize a family's financial security, and push them deeper into poverty, stunting economic growth in our communities and placing more strain on our state budget.

Please join us in voting NO on Measure 106.

Bipartisan Cafe

Copper Union

Freudian Slip

Melissa Chernaik Counseling

Monarch Partners

Morel Ink

PDX Real Assist

SRR Consulting, LLC

The Fixin' To, LLC

The Nightwood Society

The Perlene

What's the Scoop

(This information furnished by An X Do, No Cuts to Care: No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Voters,

As a family medicine nurse that serves women and families from across the state, I implore you to vote NO on Measure 106. Measure 106 would reduce access to health care, particularly for vulnerable people who already face significant barriers to receiving high-quality care. Too many families are already struggling to make ends meet; an unexpected \$500 expense (the average cost of an early-stage abortion without health insurance) would devastate most Oregonians.

When a woman is making a decision about whether to end a pregnancy, she should have medically accurate information and know it will be covered by health insurance, just like any other medical procedure. A woman should be able to end a pregnancy without pressure or any additional burdens, because abortion is health care.

We can't create more barriers to care for our most vulnerable Oregonians, which is why I hope you join me in voting NO on Measure 106.

Sincerely,

Lillian Nickerson

RN, BSN

(This information furnished by Courtney Graham, No Cuts to Care, No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

FAITH LEADERS URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON MEASURE 106

As faith leaders, the decision to oppose Measure 106 is an easy one. Measure 106 unfairly discriminates against Oregon families who are struggling with poverty and imposes even greater burdens on them by denying them essential reproductive health care. Measure 106 will reduce health coverage for nearly 400,000 Oregonians.

"God gave us the responsibility to make decisions when it comes to the most private aspects of our personal and family lives; charting the course of life is a holy act. When we are able to receive reliable preventive medical attention, such as access to contraception, we strengthen family life."

— **Rabbi Michael Z. Cahana**

"We have a duty to protect the well-being of our families. Perhaps most sacred are the reproductive rights and health of women and transgender persons who have to make the decision about if, and when, they have children. Voting NO on Measure 106 upholds our shared moral responsibility to ensure that every Oregonian has the full range of reproductive care, by removing obstacles and by providing equitable access for all."

— **Reverend Dr. Chuck Currie**

"As a parent and American, and uniquely as a rabbi, I urge you to vote NO on Measure 106. Our morals and our Jewish values command us to respect our bodies and to strive for health as a means of honoring our relationship to God. We must unite to ensure that all people are able to access the healthcare they need and deserve."

— **Rabbi Rachel L. Joseph**

**Please join us in voting NO on Measure 106
by November 6, 2018.**

(This information furnished by Courtney Graham, No Cuts to Care, No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

Women's Rights Organizations & Advocates Strongly Oppose Measure 106

The fight to advance women's equity in America starts locally with how we treat our neighbors, co-workers, family, and friends who identify as women. Every day, each of us fights to advance equity for women and girls in Oregon. Collectively, we have made incredible strides in ending discrimination and harassment in the workplace, schools, the justice system, and all other sectors of society; secured access to abortion, birth control, and reproductive rights for all women; fought to end all forms of violence against women; worked to eradicate racism, sexism, and homophobia in Oregon; and promoted equality and justice in our society.

We believe that every Oregonian—especially those who have historically been marginalized—must have access to the full range of reproductive health care, starting with proper preventative care, and continuing through postpartum care.

This includes access to safe, affordable abortion care.

Nationally we have seen a fervor in attacks on women—we are living in a time when many of our elected officials and policies do not represent the views of the majority. **This is why it's so important that we hold the line in Oregon by opposing Measure 106.**

Measure 106 strips vulnerable Oregonians of a basic right: the freedom to decide whether and when to become a parent. This right is essential in securing justice and equity for women.

Every Oregonian must be able to decide whether and when to become a parent—no matter how much money they make or how they are insured. **Please join us in resolutely voting NO on Measure 106 and defending reproductive freedom in Oregon.**

American Association of University Women - Oregon Chapter
(AAUW Oregon)

Family Forward Oregon

Forward Together

League of Women Voters

NARAL Pro-Choice Oregon

National Organization for Women - Oregon Chapter (Oregon NOW)

Oregon Women's Equity Alliance (OWEC)

Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon

(This information furnished by Christel S Allen, NARAL Pro-Choice Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

Women's Health Matters. Vote NO on Ballot Measure 106.

As healthcare providers, we believe all people and their families deserve the highest quality of care — no matter who they are or where they live.

We are committed to working with communities to break down the barriers many face in accessing health care. We fight to ensure all people get the high-quality and affordable health care they need, regardless of how much money they have or how they are insured. We care for women every day and trust women to make their own sexual and reproductive health care decisions.

Women turn to us for accurate information and nonjudgmental counseling about all of their legal medical options. That includes abortion — because abortion is health care.

The unfortunate reality is that too many women face barriers to sexual and reproductive health care and safe, legal abortion. Inequity in healthcare access is linked to many factors, including economic strain, ability and time to go to a provider, and proximity to a medical facility — all of which prevent many women from getting the care they need.

Ballot Measure 106 would further hurt Oregonians who are struggling to access the care they need — especially people of color, people with low to moderate incomes, and people who live in rural areas.

The decision about whether to have a child, end a pregnancy or choose adoption belongs to each individual. **Every patient deserves access to safe, compassionate, respectful care without barriers — no matter how much money they make or who provides their health insurance. Vote NO on Ballot Measure 106.**

Athena Goldberg, LCSW

Diane N. Solomon, PhD, PMHNP-BC, CNM

Anne Toledo, MD

Paula Bednarek, MD, MPH

Jenna Murray, MD

Jennifer Lincoln, MD

Alexandra M. Butler, MD

Smith R. Chadaga, MD, FHM, FACP

Marguerite Patricia Cohen, MD

Melanie Plaut, MD

Melissa Chernaik, MS, NCC

Tom Ewing MD

Maria Rodriguez, MD, MPH, FACOG

(This information furnished by Kimberly Koops-Wrabek, No Cuts to Care, No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

ORGANIZATIONS YOU TRUST URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON MEASURE 106

As organizations representing communities and people of color, we work to address the deep and pervasive racial inequities across Oregon. We oppose Measure 106 because it will undermine our vision for a future where our families are able to thrive regardless of where they live, how much money they make, or the insurance they have. Working families are under so much strain today and often have a hard time making ends meet. With equitable access to quality health care—that means the full range of reproductive health care, including abortion—Oregonians are able to make the best decisions for themselves and their families.

Measure 106 would...

- Ban insurance coverage for abortion for Oregonians who are already struggling financially
- Take away health coverage from teachers, firefighters and nurses
- Disproportionately harm people of color in our state

We must continue to create the conditions for all Oregonian to thrive, including access to abortion.

When critical services are denied, individuals experience additional economic hardship and long-term financial insecurity compared to those who are able to access the full range of reproductive health services.

Already, nearly a third of Oregonians live in counties with no abortion clinic. Time off of work, childcare, and transportation to a clinic become a serious burden for them. Taking away insurance coverage for abortion care will certainly push abortion even further out of reach—especially for people who already face barriers to accessing health care.

We can and should do better for each other here in Oregon. Consequently, we are opposed to cutting access to reproductive health care and urge you to **vote NO on Measure 106.**

**Coalition of Communities of Color
Forward Together
Oregon Health Equity Alliance**

(This information furnished by Jenny Lee, Coalition of Communities of Color.)

Argument in Opposition

ABORTION ACCESS HAS BEEN AN OREGON VALUE FOR MORE THAN 40 YEARS: VOTE NO ON MEASURE 106

As seniors, we remember a time before *Roe v. Wade*. But in that landmark decision, the U.S. Supreme Court declared that the Constitution protects every person's right to make their own personal medical decisions about abortion. We refuse to go backward.

For more than 40 years, Oregon has considered abortion part of the full spectrum of reproductive health services that are covered by health insurance. The right to decide when or whether to become a parent is something the majority of Oregonians support, and we must assert that belief by voting NO on Measure 106 by November 6.

We're voting NO on Measure 106 because Oregonians deserve to have access to safe, affordable abortion. Period. No one should be forced to wait for care or go without because it's not covered by their insurance.

The Vocal Seniority, representing members across Oregon Nancie Fadeley, Charter Member of Older Women's League Barbara Casey, President, Retiree Local 001, SEIU 503 Karla K. Marks, Vice President, Retiree Local 001, SEIU 503 James Jacobson, Immediate Past Vice President, Retiree Local 001, SEIU 503

(This information furnished by An X Do, No Cuts to Care: No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

The Northwest Abortion Access Fund, a local non-profit serving Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Alaska, envisions a world where people can easily access safe, legal abortion care with respect, dignity, and compassion. We run an abortion access hotline, where trained, compassionate volunteer advocates support people across the region in paying for their care. We provide financial assistance for people to cover the cost of their abortion procedure in partnership with clinics and provide travel and lodging support for people get to and from their appointment. Continuing to include abortion coverage as a part of health insurance in Oregon is fundamental so people are able to make their own medical decisions regarding a pregnancy. Being able to tell callers their procedure is fully covered provides relief, dignity, and a sense of agency to be able to make their decision not based only on cost.

We are urging a NO vote on Measure 106 because it would be devastating for the people of Oregon to lose this access.

We hear from people who cannot afford their abortion care for a myriad of reasons, from having no insurance to being excluded from coverage or having a health plan that doesn't cover their care. We see the extreme difference in need between states that include comprehensive abortion coverage for Medicaid and those that do not. Idaho, considered a hostile state to abortion rights, restricts coverage. In the last year, over half of hotline calls came from people in Idaho, where just a few hundred dollars can make the difference between getting care they need or going without. When a state denies abortion care and coverage, it does not stop people from needing abortion but rather puts the burden onto those already experiencing financial hardship. We must continue state-funded abortion care in Oregon!

Abortion is health care. Access to abortion is a human right. Denying coverage for abortion for those most vulnerable is unjust. Join us in voting NO on M106.

(This information furnished by Samantha Gladu.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon's leading economic justice organizations urge your NO vote on Measure 106

Voting NO on Measure 106 is essential to ensuring that Oregon is a state when people from every background and ability can thrive. We know that when people have access to the full range of reproductive health care—from preventive to postpartum to abortion care—they are more financially secure.

Measure 106 poses a threat to economic security for working Oregonians.

- Most Oregonians cannot afford an unexpected \$500 expense without going into debt. This is approximately the cost of an early-stage abortion. Studies show that a woman who is denied an abortion is more likely to fall into poverty than one who is able to get the care she needs.
- Working families are already under so much strain. They need support like paid time off, affordable childcare, and affordable, essential reproductive healthcare. Access to this kind of support helps individuals feel economically secure.

Measure 106 unjustly affects those who already face barriers to receiving high-quality healthcare.

- An estimated 250,000 women of reproductive age receive healthcare through the Oregon Health Plan. Under Measure 106, these Oregonians will no longer have access to the full range of reproductive healthcare they need.

Measure 106 hurts Oregon's working class, including teachers, firefighters, and nurses.

- According to the Department of Human Services and Oregon Health Authority, a total of 77,344 women of reproductive age are insured through the Public Employees' Benefit Board (PEBB) and Oregon Educators Benefits Board (OEBB) as of June 2018. Under Measure 106, these Oregonians will no longer have access to the full range of reproductive healthcare they currently rely on.

Please stand with Oregon's working families and those struggling to make ends meet.

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 106 BY NOVEMBER 6.

Fair Shot for All Coalition

Family Forward Oregon

Forward Together

Oregon Center for Public Policy

Oregon Working Families Party

(This information furnished by Lillian R Hoag, Family Forward Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 106

Don't Let Our Children Have Fewer Rights: An Open Letter from Oregon Mothers

We are proud to live in a state that trusts women to make their own healthcare decisions. This basic right is the foundation of freedom and opportunity for families. We are also fortunate that we live in a state where every person has access to the full range of reproductive health care — from prenatal to abortion to postpartum care. Access to the full range of care we may need is essential for every woman.

We cannot allow our children to have fewer rights than we do today. There is absolutely no room for uncertainty when it comes to protecting reproductive health care in Oregon — which is why we are voting NO on Ballot Measure 106.

We want our children to grow up in a world where access to the full range of reproductive health care is their reality. We want them to live in a state where no one is denied health coverage just because they are poor.

Our children deserve access to the health care they need to set goals for their future and decide for themselves if and when they want to become a parent. Please join us in protecting our children's future by voting NO on Ballot Measure 106.

Andrea Valderrama, Portland
Nichole Linder, Eugene
C. Michelle Glass, Talent
Ana del Rocío, Portland
Kirsten Brodbeck-Kenney, Lincoln City
Shawn Sellers, Salem
Rebecca Flynn, Eugene
Cyreena Boston Ashby, Portland
Adele McAfee, Bend
Emily Spicer, Salem
Cari Boyd, Lincoln City
Marisa Silver, Eugene

(This information furnished by An X Do, No Cuts to Care: No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

**WESTERN STATES CENTER AND
 RURAL ORGANIZING PROJECT
 URGE NO VOTE ON MEASURE 106**

Based in the Northwest and Mountain States, Western States Center works to achieve racial, gender and economic justice. Rural Organizing Project works to strengthen local human dignity groups to advance democracy in rural Oregon. We know from 30 years of fighting back against organized hate groups that white supremacy is a system designed to maintain control over people of color, immigrants and the sexuality and reproductive rights of women and LGBTQ people.

Measure 106 is another attack by extremist forces, emboldened by a regressive federal administration, to test whether exclusionary policies can take hold in Oregon. We can't let that happen.

As grassroots leaders in gender justice, we've worked to secure essential reproductive healthcare for Oregonians regardless of gender identity, immigration status or income. **Measure 106 is a threat to gains we've made and an affront to Oregon values of fairness and justice.**

We must defeat attacks on reproductive freedom to protect the full range of reproductive health care for our state's vulnerable communities, including communities of color, LGBTQ people, rural and working class Oregonians.

This dangerous measure would prohibit low-income Oregonians who receive health care through the Oregon Health Plan from having an abortion. Medicaid recipients often face significant health disparities and harms from racism, sexism, homophobia and transphobia.

Western States Center and Rural Organizing Project proudly join Oregonians who embrace equity and access in health care, and **urge a no vote on Measure 106.**

Access to quality reproductive health care is necessary for all families to thrive. Our health should not depend on who we are, who we love, where we live or how much money we make.

Vote **NO** on Measure 106 by November 6, to ensure divisive forces don't gain ground in Oregon with their agenda to control health care access for communities of color, LGBTQ families and women. For more about our work, visit westernstatescenter.org and rop.org.

(This information furnished by Amy Herzfeld-Copple, Western States Center.)

Argument in Opposition

This is a Rallying Cry: Kimberly's Story

Looking at me now, it is probably hard to believe that there was a time when many wondered whether I would graduate from high school. When I walked across the stage to get my diploma, my teachers told me how proud they were, because of what I overcame.

What I overcame was an abusive relationship that started when I was 15. The reason I was able to get out of that situation — and go on to attend college, work in D.C. and run for office — was because **I was able to have an abortion after I was sexually assaulted by my abusive boyfriend when I was a senior in high school.**

I remember how my hands shook as I Googled abortion providers and accidentally called deceptive crisis pregnancy centers. Finally, I reached a clinic that would take my health insurance — health insurance I had because my mom was a state employee. **We had to drive two hours to the clinic because we lived in rural Oregon, but I was fortunate that the care I received was covered under public health insurance.**

That abortion was so much more than one procedure. It was a rallying cry that I deserved to make my own decisions — that I deserved to be economically stable, to be safe and to have children when and if I wanted to. The extremists behind Measure 106 want to take away that freedom from low-income Oregonians and public employees. My story would be so different if they had their way. **That's why I want you to join me in voting NO on Measure 106 — because all women and girls deserve to have the opportunity and access that I did.**

Supported by PPAO

(This information furnished by Emily R McLain, Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

STAND UP FOR OREGON'S EDUCATORS: VOTE NO ON MEASURE 106

Oregon's educators are hardworking and dedicated to the classrooms and students we serve. We work to build the schools our students deserve. We work second or third jobs, we work nights and weekends, and do whatever it takes to ensure our students have what they need to learn and thrive.

Measure 106 viciously cuts access to reproductive health care for thousands of teachers, educational support professionals, and school employees. Oregon's educators deserve access to the full range of reproductive health care—from prenatal to abortion to postpartum care.

When all members of our community, including educators, students and family members of students can access needed healthcare they can show up ready to work, learn, and succeed.

We have come together to ask you to **vote no on Measure 106** and oppose this attack on Oregon's educators' healthcare:

Eugene Education Association
Celeste Pellicci, Science Teacher
Heidi Edwards, Community College Faculty
William Wilson, Chemistry Teacher
Rebecca Levison, Elementary School Teacher
Eric Wacker, Science Teacher
Andrea Short, Social Studies Teacher
Scott Blevins, English Teacher
Sunshine McFaul-Amadoro, English Teacher
Trisha Todd, Performing Arts Teacher
Jessica Murray, Performing Arts Teacher
Dylan Leeman, English Teacher
Nathan Goldberg, Japanese Teacher
Aura Solomon, School Counselor
Michael Williams, Social Studies Teacher
Richard Meadows, Language Arts Teacher
James Zartler, Wood Shop Teacher
Kelsey Gotch, Art Teacher
Mark Thornton, Physical Education Teacher
Diane Hicks, Elementary School Teacher
Tad Shannon, Social Studies Teacher
Alexander Luboff, Architecture/Construction CTE Teacher
Courtney Palmer, English Teacher
Cristy McCarty, Art Teacher
Gerald Young, High School Teacher
John Eisemann, High School Teacher
Russell Peterson, Science Teacher
Melody Rockwell, Art Teacher
KD Parman, Educator
Elizabeth Thiel, English Teacher
Tibor Bessko, School Counselor
Lisa Fragala, Elementary School Teacher
Suzanne Cohen, Math and Science Teacher
Melinda Ryan, Elementary School Teacher

Leah Hinkle, Education Specialist
Brinda Narayan-Wold, School Counselor
Laura Hood, Elementary School Teacher
Linda Smart, Social Studies Teacher

(This information furnished by Courtney Graham, No Cuts to Care, No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO) opposes Measure 106

We support the ability of anybody who can get pregnant to make their own decision about their reproductive health and pregnancy, and therefore urge Oregonians to **VOTE NO on MEASURE 106**. This measure would cut access to reproductive health care for Oregonians just because of how much money they make and their source of insurance. Make no mistake—it would disproportionately harm people of color in our state, including our Asian Pacific Islander (API) community.

In the past, we have engaged our API members around reproductive health and saw its linkage to other issues that our communities face, particularly the impacts of healthcare exclusion of low-income families, immigrants and citizens of the Compact of Free Association (COFA) nations of Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia. **A measure that takes away insurance coverage for reproductive health care would be a significant setback for the API community.**

APANO fights for reproductive justice grounded in body sovereignty, self-determination and family security. People should have the power and resources to make healthy decisions about their bodies, genders, sexualities and families for themselves and their communities. We must support and center the voices of women, people of color and transgender people—those who are disproportionately impacted by attacks on reproductive rights and family security but who are often excluded or the first to be left behind.

We know that paid time off, affordable child care, and access to reproductive health care, including abortion, helps ensure that families can feel economically secure. If we take away insurance coverage for abortion, we interfere with Oregonians' decisions about whether to choose adoption, end a pregnancy, or become a parent. Let's not make that mistake in Oregon.

We will not be silent. We strongly oppose cutting access to abortion in Oregon and urge you to vote NO on Measure 106.

(This information furnished by Chi K Nguyen, Interim Executive Director/Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO).)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon AFSCME Opposes Measures 106

Public employees should not have their access to legal medical procedures limited simply because their hard-earned medical benefits are publicly funded. While that may not be the initial intent of Measure 106 that is one impacts. As a union representing 28,000 workers, most of whom work in the public sector, we have a duty stand up for the healthcare access rights of our members.

Furthermore, to enshrine these changes within Oregon's constitution and limit the collective bargaining rights for union members is a dangerous and near irreversible act.

Join us in voting No on 106 to protect healthcare access and our collective bargaining rights.

(This information furnished by Joseph E Baessler, Oregon AFSCME.)

Argument in Opposition

----- THE BUS PROJECT SAYS NO ON MEASURE 106 -----

Anti-abortion extremists shouldn't get to interfere with the personal decisions that young people need to make in order to have agency in their own lives. Measure 106 sets a dangerous precedent by amending the constitution based on one group's personal beliefs, and **would disproportionately affect Oregonians ages 20-30 years old, who are most likely to need access to abortion care.**

We believe in people-driven democracy – not policies that only serve a select few. Measure 106 would strip essential reproductive health care from nearly 400,000 Oregonians, including people on the Oregon Health Plan and our state's teachers, firefighters, nurses, and other public employees.

Measure 106 takes away individual freedom and autonomy. This is not the way we do things in Oregon.

Access to the full range of reproductive health care is non-negotiable for Oregon's young people. Without the ability to decide whether and when to become a parent for themselves, young Oregonians are powerless.

Please join the Bus Project and over 30 other trusted organizations in voting NO on Measure 106.

(1) <https://www.gutmacher.org/fact-sheet/state-facts-about-abortion-oregon>

(This information furnished by Samantha Gladu, Executive Director of the Bus Project.)

Argument in Opposition

As a Republican Woman, I'm voting NO on Measure 106

When I became pregnant at the end of my first year of college, I realized that I had to either immediately find a way to pay for an abortion or drop out of school and find a way to pay for the lifetime costs of raising a child. **Because I had access to abortion, I was able to make a sound decision for myself and my future.**

Measure 106 would take away that access for hundreds of thousands of Oregonians, and impose one group's beliefs on all of us. As a Republican, I believe in personal freedom and limited government interference in people's personal lives, especially when it comes to medical decisions. **Measure 106 amends our Oregon constitution and forces one group's views on all of us. That's why I'm voting no.**

As a Republican, I also believe in fiscal conservatism. **This is why it's so important to me that voters know that Measure 106 would cost taxpayers more money, not less.** According to the official financial impact released by Oregon's Secretary of State, **Measure 106 will cost taxpayers \$19.3 million.** This number is based on an estimated increase in number of births, and the corresponding costs for health care, food, and nutrition services paid for with our taxes. If we take away abortion access for people who cannot afford the procedure, Oregon taxpayers will end up spending millions of dollars.

Please join me and many other Republicans in voting NO on Measure 106 to protect our Oregon constitution, our pocketbooks, and our personal freedom.

Anna, 25, Medford, Oregon

(This information furnished by Courtney Graham, No Cuts to Care, No on 106.)

Argument in Opposition

The Power of Safe & Accessible Abortion: Martina's Story

I have been lucky a few times in my life. I was lucky at 17, when I arrived at college. Getting to college was about creating a future free of everything that had been wrong about my childhood. But just a few months after starting college, I realized that I was pregnant and felt like all my luck had drained out. I felt entirely lost. And I remember feeling entirely relieved when I realized: "I have a choice. I can go to Planned Parenthood and have an abortion." So that's what I did. And that's how I could be lucky enough, at 21, to graduate college as the valedictorian. And lucky enough, at 27, to complete a Ph.D.

I think often about how lucky I was in that difficult time. When I realized that I had no safe place to stay if I had a medication abortion, I was offered an in-clinic procedure. When I told the nurse that I was absolutely sure I never wanted this to happen again, she told me that I could get an IUD. **What luck, to be born at the right time and into the right privilege that my right to reproductive choice wasn't in question.**

At 30, I am lucky to have a career, a husband, a dog, a home, a whole fulfilling life — one that wouldn't have been possible without the support of Planned Parenthood and without legal access to safe abortion care.

Please join me in voting NO on Measure 106. This is about so much more than just retaining the legality of abortion or this ballot measure; this is about tearing down walls that keep people trapped by poverty, prejudice and politics. This is about building bridges into a more just future.

Supported by PPAO

(This information furnished by Emily R McLain, Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

ACLU of Oregon: Vote No on Measure 106

The American Civil Liberties Union of Oregon wants voters to understand the real meaning and impact of Measure 106, as compared to the half-truths from its supporters. Measure 106 is a bad law—and an even more terrible constitutional amendment.

- Measure 106 imposes a ban on public funding for abortion—a law that Oregon voters have already rejected twice.
- Measure 106 enshrines unequal abortion access in Oregon's Constitution, and repeals existing constitutional protections. More than 30 years ago, the Oregon Court of Appeals recognized a constitutional right to equal insurance coverage for women, including for abortion care.
- The Oregon Supreme Court has ruled that Measure 106 would have an "undisputed impact on access to abortion."
- Measure 106 compromises the health care and economic security of some of the most vulnerable women and families in our state.
- Measure 106 is an extreme measure with no exceptions for rape and incest, or for abortion necessary to protect the health of the mother.
- In 2017, Oregon enacted the Reproductive Health Equity Act, which prevents the state from restricting abortion, no matter what happens to Roe v. Wade. Measure 106 would partially repeal this important new protection.
- Measure 106 mandates inferior insurance plans for all public employees, both state and local, and will deprive hundreds of thousands of Oregonians of full reproductive health coverage.

- Measure 106 is poorly written and could have far-reaching impacts. For example, it defines abortion broadly and could even prohibit publicly-funded health plans from covering some forms of contraception. It could additionally prohibit publicly-funded health care providers—like the Oregon Health and Sciences University—from offering privately-funded abortion care.

The American Civil Liberties Union of Oregon champions the civil liberties and civil rights of all Oregonians—including women, families, and public employees.

We oppose Measure 106.

**Vote No on Measure 106
to protect equal access to abortion care for all.**

(This information furnished by David Rogers, ACLU of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

**ORGANIZACIONES LATINAS LÍDERES DE OREGÓN:
¡VOTE NO EN LA MEDIDA 106!**

Vamos a votar NO a la Medida 106 porque...

En comparación con las mujeres caucásicas, las latinas tienen el doble de probabilidades de tener un embarazo no deseado; sin embargo, es menos probable que las latinas puedan pagar los servicios de aborto. La Medida 106 solo crearía más barreras.

La Medida 106 elimina la tradición de 40 años de Oregon de proporcionar la gama completa de servicios de salud reproductiva a todas las mujeres, sin tener en cuenta sus diferentes experiencias o sus ingresos.

Las familias trabajadoras necesitan apoyo, como tiempo libre pagado, cuidado infantil asequible y acceso a servicios de salud reproductiva esenciales y asequibles. El acceso a este tipo de apoyo ayuda a las personas a sentirse económicamente seguras.

**Nos oponemos firmemente a esta medida y le pedimos que vote
NO EN LA MEDIDA 106
para la salud de las familias Latinx en nuestro estado.**

**Causa
Latino Network
Oregon Latino Health Coalition
PCUN**

**OREGÓN'S LEADING LATINX ORGANIZATIONS:
VOTE NO ON MEASURE 106!**

We are voting NO on Measure 106 because...

Compared to white women, Latinas are twice as likely to experience unintended pregnancy; however, Latinas are also less likely to be able to afford abortion services. Measure 106 would only create more barriers.

Measure 106 takes away Oregon's 40-year tradition of providing the full range of reproductive health services to every woman, regardless of their background or income.

Working families need support like paid time off, affordable childcare, and affordable, essential reproductive health care. Access to this kind of support helps people feel economically secure.

**We strongly oppose this measure and ask you to vote
NO ON MEASURE 106
for the health of Latinx families in our state.**

**Causa
Latino Network
Oregon Latino Health Coalition
PCUN**

(This information furnished by Reyna I Lopez, Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste (PCUN).)

Argument in Opposition

**Planned Parenthood Health Centers
Oppose Ballot Measure 106**

For far too long, this country has penalized low-income women seeking abortion, forcing those who are already struggling to make ends meet to pay the most in order to access safe, legal care. A woman's right to make personal medical decisions about abortion shouldn't depend on where she lives, how much money she makes or how she's insured.

Planned Parenthood does more than any other organization to prevent unintended pregnancy. Thanks to increased access to birth control and sex education, Oregon's unintended pregnancy rate has reached a historic low. We are also proud to provide abortion services, and we ensure that women have accurate information about all of their options.

When women are denied insurance coverage for abortion, they are either forced to carry the pregnancy to term or pay for care out of their own pockets. Consequently, cutting off access to or placing strict limitations on abortion can have profoundly harmful effects on public health, particularly for those who already face significant barriers to receiving high-quality care, such as low-income women, immigrant women, young women and women of color.

Women with lower socioeconomic status — specifically those who are least able to afford out-of-pocket medical expenses — already experience disproportionately high rates of adverse health conditions. Ballot Measure 106 would only exacerbate existing health disparities.

In the United States, 6 in 10 women who access abortion already have a child. And when a woman is living paycheck to paycheck, denying coverage for an abortion can push her deeper into poverty. Indeed, studies show that a woman who seeks an abortion but is denied is more likely to fall into poverty than one who is able to get an abortion.

On behalf of the 60,000 Oregonians we serve every year, Planned Parenthood health centers urge voters to reject Ballot Measure 106.

Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon

Planned Parenthood Columbia Willamette

Planned Parenthood Southwestern Oregon

(This information furnished by Emily R McLain, Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

BASIC RIGHTS OREGON: Vote NO on Measure 106

Measure 106 denies low-income Oregonians the full range of reproductive health services. We believe that LGBTQ equality is fundamentally about bodily autonomy, including the decision on when to become parents. While people of all sexual orientations and gender identities may struggle to pay for their healthcare needs, LGBTQ people face higher rates of poverty and unemployment and have much higher barriers to getting care:

- A study published in the American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology suggests bisexual young women are at a greater risk of accidental pregnancy, partly because they are less likely than straight women to use contraceptives.
- A study by the Williams Institute at the UCLA School of Law indicates "14.1% of lesbian couples and 7.7% of gay male couples receive food stamps, compared to 6.5% of different-sex married couples."
- A report from the National Center for Transgender Equality finds that transgender people are three times as likely to be unemployed as the general population.

- According to the Center for American Progress, "Discrimination played a role in preventing a significant number of LGBTQ people from seeking care." A survey by the organization concludes that 8% of all LGBTQ people and 22% of transgender people "avoided or postponed needed medical care because of disrespect or discrimination from healthcare staff."

Join Basic Rights Oregon in voting NO on Measure 106, because how much money is in your pocket or how you identify shouldn't determine if you can have an abortion.

Measure 106 is a dangerous constitutional amendment that prohibits low-income Oregonians who receive health care through the Oregon Health Plan from having an abortion. When someone is making a decision about whether to end a pregnancy, they should have medically accurate information and know it will be covered by health insurance, **just like any other medical procedure.**

Vote NO on Measure 106 to defend reproductive health freedom for all Oregonians, including our LGBTQ community.

(This information furnished by Nancy Haque, Basic Rights Oregon.)

Proposed by initiative petition to be voted on by the voters of Linn County at the General Election, November 6, 2018.

Local Measure No.

22-174

Second Amendment Preservation Ordinance

Explanatory Statement	140
Arguments in Favor	None
Arguments in Opposition	None

Ballot Title Caption

Second Amendment Preservation Ordinance

Question

Should Linn County adopt the Second Amendment Preservation Ordinance?

Summary

A yes vote adopts and makes the Second Amendment Preservation Ordinance part of Linn County's County Code. If approved the ordinance does the following: Entrusts the Linn County Sheriff to determine, on behalf of Linn County, whether certain firearms laws are constitutional. If the Linn County Sheriff determines that any federal, state or local laws affecting firearms, firearms accessories or ammunition are unconstitutional then the County may not authorize the use of funds, resources, employees, agencies, contractors, buildings, detention centers, or offices for the purpose of enforcing such laws. Approval of this measure would subject people or corporations who violate this measure by enforcing firearms laws declared by the sheriff to be unconstitutional to a fine of up to \$2,000 for an individual and \$4,000 for a corporation.

Explanatory Statement

A YES vote adopts and makes the Second Amendment Preservation Ordinance part of Linn County's County Code. If approved the ordinance does the following:

Entrusts the Linn County Sheriff to determine, on behalf of Linn County, whether certain firearms laws are Constitutional.

If the Linn County Sheriff determines that any federal, state or local laws affecting firearms, firearms accessories or ammunition are Unconstitutional then the County may not authorize the use of funds, resources, employees, agencies, contractors, buildings, detention centers, or offices for the purpose of enforcing such laws.

Approval of this measure would subject people or corporations who violate this measure by enforcing firearms laws declared by the sheriff to be unconstitutional to a fine of up to \$2,000 for an individual and \$4,000 for a corporation.

Committee Members:

- Dixie Oxender
- Monte A. Oxender
- William R. Treleven III
- Annastasia L. Jaques
- M. Roy Bendshadler

(This impartial statement explaining the measure was provided by the Explanatory Committee appointed pursuant to Linn County Code 250.350.)

This measure is referred to the Voters of Linn County by the Linn County Board of County Commissioners for their approval or rejection at the November 6, 2018, General Election.

Local Measure No.

22-176

Making the Linn County Surveyor an appointed position.

Explanatory Statement	141
Arguments in Favor	None
Arguments in Opposition	None

Ballot Title Caption

Making the Linn County Durveyor an appointed position.

Question

Shall the mode of selection of the Linn County Surveyor be changed from election by voters to appointment by Commissioners?

Summary

Approval of this measure would change the mode of selection of the Office of the Linn County Surveyor from an elective office to an appointed position. Currently the Linn County Surveyor is elected by the voters of Linn County to a four year term. Approval of this measure would change the office to a position appointed by the Linn County Board of Commissioners for an indefinite period. The Linn County Board of Commissioners adopted Ordinance 2018-252 to change the mode of selection of the Linn County Surveyor from election to appointment. Under Oregon law, the change of the mode of selection of an elective county office to an appointed position must be submitted to and approved by the voters of Linn County before taking effect. A Yes vote would change the mode of selection of the Linn County Surveyor from election to appointment by the Linn County Board of Commissioners. A No vote would retain the current mode of selection of the Linn County Surveyor of election by the voters.

Explanatory Statement

Approval of this measure would change the mode of selection of the Office of the Linn County Surveyor from an elective office to an appointed position. Currently the Linn County Surveyor is elected by the voters of Linn County to a four year term. Approval of this measure would change the office to a position appointed by the Linn County Board of Commissioners for an indefinite period. Approval of this measure would not affect the current term of office of the Linn County Surveyor which expires in January 2021.

In 2009 the Oregon Legislature enacted Chapter 491 Oregon Laws 2009 which changed State law to require that the governing body of a county appoint a county surveyor, unless an adopted county charter or a county ordinance provides otherwise. Prior to 2009, Oregon State law required that county surveyors be elected. The Linn County Board of Commissioners, as the governing body for Linn County, adopted Ordinance No. 2009-555 providing that the Linn County Surveyor would continue as an elected position.

In August 2018 the Linn County Board of Commissioners adopted Ordinance 2018-252 to change the mode of selection of the Linn County Surveyor from election to appointment. Under Oregon law, the change of the mode of selection of a County elective office to an appointed position must be submitted to and approved by the voters of Linn County before taking effect.

(This impartial statement explaining the measure was provided by the Linn County Board of Commissioners.)

It is against the law to:

- sign another person's ballot return envelope for them
- vote more than once in an election or cast a fraudulent ballot
- vote a ballot if you are not legally qualified to do so
- coerce, pressure or otherwise unduly influence another voter
- sell, offer to sell, purchase or offer to purchase another voter's ballot
- obstruct an entrance of a building in which a voting booth or official ballot dropsite is located
- deface, remove, alter or destroy another voter's ballot, a posted election notice or election equipment or supplies
- attempt to collect voted ballots within 100 feet of an official ballot dropsite
- establish a dropsite without displaying a sign stating "Not An Official Ballot Dropsite"

Any violations of the identified election laws are subject to penalties ranging from Civil Penalties (Up to \$250 per Violation), Class A Misdemeanors or Class C Felonies.

For more information about voting in Oregon or if you think your rights as a voter have been violated

 **oregonvotes.gov**



1 866 673 8683

se habla español

TTY 1 800 735 2900

for the hearing impaired

Name	Page
Aoyagi, Robyn Ridler	38
Auer, Aaron	25
Beilstein, Mike	24
Beyer, Lee L	28
Boshart Davis, Shelly	32
Brenneman, Jessi	44
Brown, Kate	26
Buehler, Knute	27
Chen, Nick	26
DeFazio, Peter	25
Gelser, Sara A	29
Herbert, Mark F	31
Hyatt, Cynthia	33
Johnson II, Alex	43
Johnson, Bessie	44
Kittson-MaQatish, Rachel	41
Konopa, Sharon	42
Lindsey, John K	36
Manicke, Robert	39
Nelson, Adrienne	38
Newton, Stephanie	37
Olsen, Dick	43
Parks, Erik S	29
Plagmann, Teri L	41
Powers, Steven R	39
Robinson, Art	24
Schwartz, Robert	28
Sprenger, Sherrie	34
Starnes, Patrick	27
Stetz-Waters, Fay	40
Sullivan, Gary	36
Taylor, Jerred	32
Wilde, Marty	31
Windsor-White, Renee	34
Wynhausen, Michael	40

NONPROFIT
CAR-RT SORT
U.S. Postage
PAID
Portland, OR
Permit No. 815



Residential Customer

7 Linn

Linn

541-967-3831
TTY 1-800-735-2900
fax 541-926-5109
www.co.linn.or.us

vote!



➤ **oregonvotes.gov**

☎ **1 866 673 8683**
se habla español