voters' pamphlet



STATE OF OREGON SPECIAL ELECTION JUNE 29, 1993 Compiled and Distributed by

Secretary of State

This voters' pamphlet is provided for assistance in casting your vote-by-mail ballot. Usually the voters' pamphlet is provided to assist electors at the polls.

PHIL KEISLING
SECRETARY OF STATE
MICHAEL GREENFIELD



STATE OF OREGON SECRETARY OF STATE 136 STATE CAPITOL SALEM, OREGON 97310-0722 (503) 378-4139

Dear Oregon Voter:

The Voters' Pamphlet is one of the state's strongest and most visible symbols of commitment to the democratic voting process. Since 1903, the Voters' Pamphlet has helped Oregonians make informed choices for their future.

This pamphlet provides you with information about the single statewide measure that appears on your ballot for the June 29 election. The pamphlet also contains information about voter registration and absentee ballots.

This Special Election Voters' Pamphlet is printed in a new tabloid format rather than the familiar bound booklet because of the limited information submitted for this pamphlet. Using this format reduced the cost of publishing the Voters' Pamphlet, resulting in a savings for taxpayers.

The June 29 election is a vote-by-mail election and is the first vote-by-mail election to have a statewide issue on the bellot. Ballots will be mailed to all registered voters starting on June 11 and continuing into the following week.

Please read the Voters' Pamphlet carefully, cast your ballot and return it to your county elections office by 8:00 p.m. Tuesday, June 29.

Best,

Phil Keisling
Secretary of State

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | P |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| County Election Offices | | |
| Information | *************************************** | |
| Measure No. 1 | | , |
| Ballot Title | | |
| Complete Text | | |
| Explanatory Statement | *************************************** | |
| Legislative Argument in Support | *************************************** | |
| Arguments in Favor | ************************************* | |
| Arguments in Opposition | | |

On the Cover:

Ezra Meeker arrived in Oregon in 1852, by excart over the Oregon Trail, and returned by excart over the same route in 1906, painting inscriptions on landmarks along the trail.

Photograph courtesy of Oregon Historical Society, #OrHi 9016.

INFORMATION

GENERAL

Material for the statewide measure in your Official 1993 June Special Election Voters' Pamphlet includes the bellot title, the complete text of the proposed measure, an impartial statement explaining the measure and its effect, estimate of financial impact and any arguments filed by proponents and opponents. The page number for each item can be found in the table of contents above.

Oregon law requires the Legislature to submit one argument in support of each measure it refers to the people. Citizens or organizations may also file arguments in favor of or in opposition to each measure by purchasing space for \$300 or by submitting a petition signed by 1,000 electors. The Secretary of State may not accept any argument that is not accompanied by the specified fee or the requisite number of signatures.

The Voters' Pamphlet has been compiled by the Secretary of State since 1903, when Oregon became one of the first states to provide for the printing and distribution of such a publication.

One copy of the Voters' Pamphlet is mailed to every household in the state. Additional copies are available at the State Capitol, post offices, courthouses and all county election departments.

The June Election is a vote-by-mail election. If you are registered to vote by June 8, you will receive your ballot in the mail. Absentee or replacement ballots are available from your county elections office.

BE A WELL-INFORMED VOTER. STUDY THE ISSUES AND VOTE.

IMPORTANT: YOUR VOTED BALLOT
MUST BE RECEIVED IN YOUR COUNTY ELECTIONS
OFFICE BY 8:00 P.M. JUNE 29 TO BE COUNTED.

VOTER REGISTRATION

You may register to vote by mail or in person if:

- (1) You are a citizen of the United States;
- (2) You will be 18 years of age or older on election day; and
- (3) You are a resident of Oregon.

IMPORTANT: You may register to vote if you meet the above qualifications, but you must be registered by 5:00 p.m. on June 8, 1993.

You must reregister if:

- (1) Your registration has been canceled;
- (2) Your name has been changed by marriage or court order;
- (3) Your residence or mailing address has changed for any reason; or
- (4) You desire to change your political party affiliation.

You may vote one time in the precinct of registration without reregistering if:

- (1) Your name has been changed by marriage or court order;
- (2) Your residence or mailing address has been changed by the United States Postal Service, or city or county, but the location of the residence has not changed and you qualify for and obtain a certificate of registration from the county election office; or
- (3) Your mailing address has changed but the location of your residence has not changed.

You may cast a ballot even though there may be a question about the validity of your registration.

If such a question exists, the election official may require you to vote a "challenged" ballot. You will be required to sign a statement indicating you believe you are eligible to vote the ballot being issued.

The "challenge" process is provided by Oregon law and simply means your ballot will not be counted until the election official can determine that you were entitled to vote. The election official has until the 19th day after the election to determine the validity of your registration. This process is used to assure that no voter is denied the constitutional right to vote because of an administrative error and to assure that votes which may be fraudulent are not counted.

MEASURE NO. 1

NO 🗆

State of Oregon

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 10—Referred to the Electorate of Oregon by the 1993 Legislature, to be voted on at the Special Election, June 29, 1993.

BALLOT TITLE

1 ALLOWS VOTER APPROVAL OF URBAN RENEWAL BOND REPAYMENT OUTSIDE LIMIT

QUESTION: Shall Oregon's Constitution be amended allowing local voters to authorize taxes outside Article XI limit to repay urban renewal bonds?

EXPLANATION: Payments for bonds are generally excluded from the property tax rate limit, but courts have interpreted Ballot Measure 5, adopted in 1990, to include taxes to pay urban renewal bonds within the limit. This measure maintains the limit on urban renewal bonds, which may be used for community development and housing, unless local voters authorize bond payment outside the limit. If this measure passes, cities or counties could ask voters to approve taxes outside the tax limitation to repay current or future urban renewal bonds.

ESTIMATE OF FINANCIAL IMPACT—Local revenue impact. No direct impact. To the extent voters approve urban renewal taxes to repay debt outside Measure 5's limits, urban renewal revenue will increase. If taxes imposed outside the limit replace levies currently imposed inside the limit and the area is currently above the Measure 5 monachool limit, local city and county revenue will increase. State revenue impact: No direct impact.

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

 ${\bf PARAGRAPH~1.}$ Section 1c, Article IX of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, is amended to read:

Sec. 1c. (1) The Legislative Assembly may provide that the ad valorem taxes levied by any taxing unit, in which is located all or part of an area included in a redevelopment or urban renewal project, may be [divided] calculated so that the taxes [levied against] from any increase in the [true cash] real market value, as [defined] provided by law, of property in such area [obtaining] occurring after the effective date of the ordinance or resolution approving the redevelopment or urban renewal plan for such area, shall be used to pay any indebtedness incurred for the redevelopment or urban renewal project. The legislature

may enact such laws as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section

(2) The limitations of section 11b, Article XI of this Constitution, shall apply to taxes from any increase in the real market value described in subsection (1) of this section unless a majority of the electors residing in the area subject to the taxes and voting on the question specifically (A) authorize bonded indebtedness for redevelopment or urban renewal projects, or B) authorize the levy of taxes not subject to the limitations of section 11b, Article XI of this Constitution, for the purpose of paying the principal and interest on outstanding bonded indebtedness previously issued to finance an urban renewal or redevelopment project or projects. This subsection shall apply only to bonded indebtedness approved at an election held on or after the date of the election at which this subsection is approved.

PARAGRAPH 2. The amendment proposed by this resolution shall be submitted to the people for their approval or rejection at a special election held throughout this state on the date specified in section 2, chapter 24, Oregon Laws 1993 (Enrolled Senate Bill 357).

The State of Oregon has attempted to correct spelling errors, but is not responsible for grammar, syntax or inaccuracies of measure arguments.

MEASURE NO. 1

State of Oregon

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

In November 1990, Oregon voters approved Measure 5 and amended the constitution in order to limit most property taxes. Taxes to finance urban renewal projects fall within Measure 5's limits.

1993's Ballot Measure One is a proposed constitutional amendment which, if adopted, will allow voters in a city or county to either authorize bonded indebtedness for urban renewal projects or authorize taxes to pay existing urban renewal bonded indebtedness. In either case, such taxes will be outside Measure 5's limits.

Voters may thus authorize, with a single vote, future urban renewal indebtedness on either a project-by-project or multiple-project basis, depending on what the governing body of the city or county submits to its voters. If a city or county svoters so authorize, property taxes for urban renewal in their city or county may increase with no further votes. The resulting taxes will be levied on all properties in the locality.

Some urban renewal plans involve projects which are not capital construction or improvements. These projects include, but are not limited to, acquisition and sale of land, relocation of persons and businesses displaced by the project, leasing or management of housing, grants and loans. Taxes for these local projects will be permitted outside Measure 5's limits if:

- (1) Oregon voters approve Ballot Measure One; and if,
- (2) city or county voters later approve a local measure authorizing such funding.

This measure also makes some changes to the existing section of the Oregon Constitution governing urban renewal taxes. The change from "true cash" to "real market" brings the section into conformity with Measure 5. The change from "divided" to "calculated" reflects the fact that division is only one of the calculations used in determining urban

Committee Members: Senator Shirley Gold Representative Gail Shibley Representative Cedric Hayden Don McIntire Barbara Seymour Appointed by: President of the Senate Speaker of the House Secretary of State Secretary of State Members of the Committee

(This Committee was appointed to provide an impartial explanation of the ballot measure pursuant to ORS 251.215. The statement was modified and certified by the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon pursuant to ORS 251.235.)

LEGISLATIVE ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT

MEASURE 1 RESTORES URBAN RENEWAL FUNDING OPTIONS FOR ALL OREGON COMMUNITIES.

Court decisions last year declared that Measure 5 limits applied to repayment of urban renewal bonds, including bonds issued before Measure 5 was passed. That nullified provisions of an urban renewal reform law passed by the 1991 legislature. As a result, job-creating urban renewal projects are no longer a practical option for a number of communities.

How Does Urban Renewal Work?

In simple terms: A line is drawn around an area that is stagnating, one where property values are not rising. Plans for major public improvements like roadways, street lighting, utility lines, green spaces, housing and other facilities are drawn up. Then urban renewal bonds are sold, the plans implemented and private investors encouraged to come in or expand in the area.

The result: The community gains new assets; property values rise and so do tax revenues. Some of the city-wide increase in revenues is used to pay off the bonds.

Measure 1 Restores Urban Renewal Options.

The legislature has referred Measure 1 for voter approval. It would amend the Oregon Constitution, allowing voters in local communities to decide whether to allow urban renewal bonds to be used for projects in their community.

Measure 1 expands local voter control over urban renewal by requiring local governments to seek approval of local voters before starting any urban renewal plans to be financed outside Measure 5 limits.

However, voter approval of Measure 1 itself will NOT raise anyone's taxes.

RESTORING URBAN RENEWAL IS IMPORTANT TO HELP LOCAL COMMUNITIES CREATE JOBS.

Urban renewal is by far the most important job-creating economic development tool available to local communities throughout Oregon. Communities have used it for more than 30 years to build and diversify their local economies. Urban renewal programs leverage limited public dollars to stimulate private investments. Urban renewal projects in Oregon bring in at least \$7 of private money for every \$1 of public funds invested in local

Please Join Us in Voting YES on Measure 1 for the Economic Health of Oregon's Communities.

Committee Members: Senator Eugene (Gene) Timms Representative Tom Brian Representative Margaret Carter Appointed by: President of the Senate Speaker of the House Speaker of the House

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

MEASURE NO. 1

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

Measure 1 Requires Local Governments to Seek Approval of Local Voters Before Starting Any Urban Renewal Plans Funded Outside Measure 5 Limits.

Measure 1 requires government officials interested in funding urban renewal projects outside Measure 5's property tax limit to first get local voters' approval. It makes sure urban renewal bonds are treated like other bonds under the Oregon Constitution.

MEASURE 1 DOES NOT RAISE ANYONE'S TAXES

The proposed amendment will not raise anyone's taxes. It only allows citizens in communities around the state to decide for themselves in a local election whether to fund urban renewal projects.

Urban Renewal Has Been the Best Way for Local Communities All Over Oregon from Milton Freewater to Newport to Create Jobs and Diversify Local Economies.

Urban renewal financing has been effective in the state's larger urban areas as a tool for managing growth and livability, and in small communities that have needed to generate alternative livelihoods for their citizens.

Urban renewal programs leverage limited public dollars to stimulate private investments. Urban renewal projects in Oregon bring in at least \$7 of private money for every \$1 of public funds invested in local projects.

KEEP OUR COMMUNITIES WORKING.

Vote YES on Measure 1.

(This information furnished by Pat McCormick, Campaign Manager, Oregonians for Urban Renewal.)

(This space purchased for \$300 in accordance with ORS 251.255.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

Our City and Others Like Philomath Need Urban Renewal as a Tool to Keep Our Community Working.

State of

Benton County, where Philomath is located, has the lowest unemployment rate in the state. But in our community, unemployment remains a major concern. Troubles in the timber industry are hitting Philomath hard.

Just before Measure 5 was passed in 1990, Philomath formed an urban renewal district to encourage economic development. A lot needs to be done to attract new jobs to Philomath (street paving projects, and water and sewer improvements are needed). Urban renewal is clearly the best tool we can use to help ourselves.

The Court Decision Halted Urban Renewal Plans.

Last year's court decision, subjecting urban renewal to the Measure 5 limit, hit us hard, too. Because assessed values are low in our community, tax rates have been high. So Measure 5 reduced taxes here. But because property tax limits forced budget reductions for all local governments in our community, the court decision scuttled our urban renewal plans.

Now, Philomath can't use urban renewal financing for local projects without further cutting the city's limited budgets for general services, such as fire and police. That doesn't make sense.

Measure 1 Will Allow Philomath Voters to Decide for Themselves if They Want to Repay Urban Bonds Outside the Measure & Limit.

We strongly support Measure 1 because it lets voters in Philomath choose whether to use urban renewal bonds here to help create new jobs in a community that desperately needs the

Citizens in other cities may not think urban renewal is right for them. We respect that. So does Measure 1. We simply ask them to let us have the chance to put urban renewal to work here.

Please vote YES on Measure 1.
Urban Renewal Is Philomath's Best Option for Building
Our Local Economy.

(This information furnished by Van O. Hunsaker, Mayor of Philomath.)

State of

(This space purchased for \$300 in accordance with ORS 251,255.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

MEASURE NO. 1

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

FOR MORE THAN 30 YEARS, URBAN RENEWAL HAS BEEN A MAJOR TOOL FOR COMMUNITIES TO REVITALIZE THEIR DOWNTOWNS.

Measure 1 Will Keep Urban Renewal Working for Communities Throughout the State.

Downtowns represent the core of every community. Yet in many Oregon cities, age and change have taken their toll on downtown. That was a major reason Oregonians adopted urban renewal financing in 1960. Since then, it has been one of Oregon's most effective tools for downtown redevelopment.

Urban renewal financing has invigorated downtowns in the state's larger cities, providing the seed money to spark private-sector investment, build affordable housing and create jobs. And in smaller communities it has energized similar investments in core areas—improving streets, rehabilitating buildings, and providing low-cost loans to small businesses.

Citizens Should Have the Right to Vote for Urban Renewal Programs that Will Help in Their Community.

Examples of what's at risk show how different communities use urban renewal in different ways.

- Roseburg: Unless the congested intersection of Edenbower Boulevard and Broad Street is improved and a signal installed, prime commercial property will go undeveloped.
- Albany: Improvements planned for First, Second and Main streets, as well as a business loan program, will have to be canceled.
- Klamath Falls: Street improvements, and a downtown parking structure aimed at attracting business to an adjacent industrial area, are in jeopardy.
- Astoria: A project including a new conference center, private hotel and OSU seafood laboratory project downtown is on hold, hurting downtown retailers who are counting on the project to boost their businesses through tourism.

The economic vitality of many Oregon cities will be sapped if urban renewal programs are no longer an option to provide incentives for economic growth and downtown revitalization.

The Oregon Downtown Development Association urges you to please vote YES on Measure 1.

Keep Our Communities Working.

(This information furnished by Brian Scott, President & Executive Director, Oregon Downtown Development Association.)

(This space purchased for \$300 in accordance with ORS 251,255.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

RESTORING URBAN RENEWAL IN PORTLAND IS THE KEY TO CONTINUED JOB GROWTH AND THE CURBING OF INNER-CITY DECAY.

Urban Renewal Has Helped Transform Portland.

Portland today is a model other cities are trying to copy because the unique partnership between the public and private sectors has reshaped the face of the city. Urban renewal was used to create Tom McCall Waterfront Park in place of a freeway, put in Pioneer Courthouse Square, preserve Union Station, enhance the Oregon Convention Center area, develop RiverPlace and Pioneer Place, build Airport Way and develop affordable housing downtown.

On an investment of \$150 million in tax dollars over the last three decades, urban renewal has generated more than \$2 billion in private investment in Portland—close to a 1,300 percent return.

Assessed values in revitalized areas have grown three times as fast as values city-wide over the last 20 years. Urban renewal programs have generated about 35,000 new jobs in the same period. But those success stories are at risk.

Without Measure 1, Portland Voters Have No Choice About Using Urban Renewal Finance in the Future.

Court rulings last year declared urban renewal bonds were subject to Measure 5 tax limits. As a result, urban renewal bonds are no longer a practical option for the city to use to finance redevelopment programs. Issuing new bonds would force reductions in general fund services such as police, fire and parks. Even repaying bonds issued prior to Measure 5's passage will cost nearly \$9 million per year from the city's general fund.

Measure 1 Restores Choice for Portland Voters.

Measure 1 authorizes voters in local communities such as Portland to decide for themselves whether to use urban renewal financing, and how it will be repaid. It's a constitutional change that will not raise anyone's taxes. It simply allows local voters to determine if urban renewal is the best option in their own local community.

> The Portland Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce Strongly Supports Measure 1.

It's Vital to Portland's Economic Health.

Please Join Us in Voting YES on Measure 1.

(This information furnished by Donald S. McClave, President, Portland Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce.)

(This space purchased for \$300 in accordance with ORS 251,255.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

MEASURE NO. 1

State of Oregon

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

OREGON'S CHAMBER EXECUTIVES STRONGLY SUPPORT MEASURE 1 AS THE BEST MEANS TO GIVE LOCAL COMMUNITIES THE ABILITY TO CREATE JOBS.

Chambers of Commerce are committed to the prosperity of the businesses and people in the communities they serve. Oregon chamber executives—from Albany to Astoria, from The Dalles to Klamath Falls—recognize that urban renewal is the best job-creating, local development option available to most communities.

Local Development Projects Are at Risk.

Right now, for a number of Oregon communities, urban renewal is no longer an option. Courts declared last September that urban renewal bonds would be subject to the Measure 5 limit. Communities that are at the Measure 5 limit can no longer depend on urban renewal bonds to provide the local matching funds on federal or state projects. Nor can those communities make public investments that leverage private-sector investment is local projects that create inde in local projects that create jobs.

Measure 1 Would Guarantee Local Control Over Urban Renewal.

Measure 1 would make sure every community in Oregon has the choice to use urban renewal because it's the best alternative to generate jobs or revitalize a stagnating area.

Passage of Measure 1 will not increase taxes for anyone. It merely gives local voters control over whether, when and how to use urban renewal.

More than half of all Oregonians live in communities that have benefited from urban renewal programs. For every dollar of public funds allotted to urban renewal in the state, more than \$7 in private funds have been invested. Those investments have diversified and strengthened local economies and created new jobs.

> Urban Renewal Is an Important Asset in Oregon's Efforts to Help Its Communities Prosper.

> > Keep Our Communities Working.

Vote YES on Measure 1, and Be Sure to Return Your Ballot by June 29!

(This information furnished by Michael McLaran, Executive Director, Albany Area Chamber of Commerce.)

o nurchased for \$300 in accordance with ORS 251,255.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR

I'VE OPPOSED URBAN RENEWAL IN THE PAST. BUT MEASURE 1 PUTS VOTERS IN CHARGE OF URBAN RENEWAL PLANS.

THAT'S THE REFORM I'VE BEEN WORKING FOR.

Vote YES on Measure 1.

I campaigned for Mayor of Tualatin in opposition to urban renewal. After being elected, I realized the value this important tool has for local communities—especially when you add Measure 1's requirements for local voter participation in the decision to use urban

Measure 1 will require local officials to consult with voters and get their approval BEFORE starting any urban renewal plans funded outside the Measure 5 limit. That forces urban renewal plans to really reflect what the community wants.

Urban Renewal Bonds Outside Measure 5 Limit Should Be Treated Like General Obligation Bonds. Measure 1 Does That.

Measure 1 changes the Oregon Constitution to treat urban renewal bonds outside the Measure 5 limit much like general obligation bonds. Local officials must get voter approval before bonds can be issued. Only with voter approval can repayment be made from taxes outside Measure 5 limit.

> Join me in voting yes on Measure 1. GIVE LOCAL VOTERS CONTROL OF URBAN RENEWAL.

(This information furnished by Steven L. Stolze, President, SLS Custom Homes.)

Oregon

(This space purchased for \$300 in accordance with ORS 251.255.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

MEASURE NO. 1 State of

ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

You are asked to <u>Yote Uncontrolled Property Tax Increases</u> for Urban Renewal Taxes for 37 Cities and Counties. Measure 1 is costing you \$900,600.00.

 In Tualatin, Oregon, an average \$114,600.00 home had before the Supreme Court ruling in September, 1992, an Urban Renewal Tax of \$327.57 while the tax for the entire Government of Tualatin was \$343.36. This is a 95% ratio in property taxes for Urban Renewal, Vote No. Urban Renewal Boards are not Elected.

In the Portland Urban Renewal Area our preliminary review of Employees, discloses that over 50% or more do not live in the property tax paying area. Vote No.

A. U.S. Bancorp Tower, First Interstate Tower and buildings in the Waterfront assessments areas do not pay school or local government services as homeowners and other businesses do. Eighty per cent of these taxes goes to Urban Renewal. Vote No.

B. Measure 1 is designed to hoodwink your vote. Remember Tualatin, where there is a 95% Urban Renewal Ratio Tax. Vote No. Don't over rule the Supreme Court.

3. In 1968 we voted on Urban Renewal and in September 1992, the State Supreme Court agreed Urban Renewal Taxes were under Measure 5. With State, Counties, Cities and Schools adding over 3,344 new employees since Measure 5 passed; keep Urban Renewal under Measure 5. Vote No. Oregon Tax Court limited U.R. Taxes to Measure 5.

4. The Legislature passed Measure 1 to raise your property taxes, for Urban Renewal Employees and Foreign Corporations which get 100% property tax relief in Urban Renewal areas, yet businesses and homeowners have to pay higher property taxes to benefit the Foreign Corporations but with no new broader tax plan for Public Education.

5. Renters and Homeowners, the State of Oregon, Counties and Cities are using your tax dollars to campaign on this Measure, VOTE NO. Save rental and house payment increases. THINK-Urban Renewal Boards Are Not Elected.

(This information furnished by Clyde V. Brummell, President, Oregon Homeowner's

(This space purchased for \$300 in accordance with ORS 251,255.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

VOTERS SHOULD KNOW THE FACTS ABOUT MEASURE 1

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION UNNECESSARY

VOTE NO

The Constitution permits voters to approve bonds outside the Measure 5 limits now. No change is needed.

Cities having worthy projects to finance by property taxes need only go to voters and ask approval of general obligation bonds payable outside the limit. Proponents of Measure 1 want to hoodwink voters into letting them issue bonds whenever they please without voter review or approval—as before Measure 5. In 1991 Portland collected over \$17 million in property taxes for urban renewal with none of it approved by the voters.

ALL OREGON TAXPAYERS SUBSIDIZE URBAN RENEWAL THE SUBSIDY MUST STOP

Urban renewal projects withdraw assessed valuation from the general tax rolls for extend-Orban renewal projects withtraw assessed valuation in the general section of time. Because of the withheld valuation, taxpayers of governments overlapped by an urban renewal government pay more to those governments, and school districts collect less money and require more support from state-wide taxpayers

Portland has an urban renewal program which siphoned off more than \$17 million of the property tax in 1991 and withholds tremendous assessed valuation from the general tax roll. Persons paying taxes to Multnomah County, Port of Portland, and Metro (in Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington Counties) pay taxes at a higher rate to make up for the withheld property value. The State pays to make up loss to schools. Taxpayers of Gresham, Troutdale, Fairview, Wood Village, Maywood Park, and unincorporated Multnomah County plus state-wide taxpayers subsidize Portland's urban renewal, but none has a say in its creation or expansion. If free-wheeling urban renewal is permitted again, taxpayers throughout Oregon will pay even higher subsidy to Portland.

UNCONTROLLED UR TAXES WERE REINED IN BY MEASURE 5 MAINTAIN TAXPAYER CONTROL OVER TAXES

VOTE NO

Before Measure 5, urban renewal governments established projects, issued bonds, and collected taxes without going to the voters. Special landholders, developers, and businesses have been the principal beneficiaries. Suddenly now, urban renewal is promoted to benefit the poor, but to date the poor and needy have received little. More often, low-cost housing has been destroyed and poorly replaced. Urban renewal for the poor has been ignored because it is not profitable—for developers or the government. Taxpayers must maintain control of property taxes.

SPECIAL LEGISLATION AT TAXPAYERS' EXPENSE

The Legislature that could not find adequate funding for schools easily found \$900,600 to fund a special state-wide election for this unneeded amendment to the Constitution. The State's priorities for special interests are obvious.

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 1

(This information furnished by Peter and Dorothy Smith, Multnomah County.)

(This space purchased for \$300 in accordance with ORS 251.255.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

MEASURE NO. 1 State of Oregon

ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

VOTE NO ON MORE TAXES!

This measure will increase taxes by allowing NEW PROPERTY TAXES IN EXCESS OF MEASURE 5'S LIMITS.

MEASURE 5 IS SUPPOSED TO BE A CEILING, NOT A FLOOR. It should limit the "rent" we pay government in order to use our own property to no more than \$15 per thousand. By successively excluding various taxes from the Measure 5 limits, we will send property taxes right back up to previous levels.

SEND SALEM A MESSAGE!

THEY JUST DON'T GET IT. Six months after we passed Measure 5, the Legislature RAISED INCOME TAXES \$180 MILLION DOLLARS! Local governments have been raising every tax and fee they can, to fatten their bureaucracies, while blaming Measure 5. Instead of cutting waste and reforming government, SPECIAL INTERESTS ARE PUSHING A MULTI-BILLION DOLLAR SALES TAX IF YOU GIVE THE GREEN LIGHT BY VOTING FOR MORE TAXES.

IT'S TIME TO FIGHT BACK!

OREGON'S TAXPAYER PROTECTION PLAN WILL BAN ANY NEW TAXES UNLESS YOU APPROVE. NO TAXATION WITHOUT DIRECT REPRESENTATION. Instead of just voting NO on new taxes, you can work FOR TAX LIMITATION, to send a message to SALEM AND WASHINGTON, D.C.

TAXPAYER PROTECTION INITIATIVE 19201 S.E. DIVISION GRESHAM, OR 97030 (503) 867-8315

(This information furnished by Frank Eisenzimmer, Chairman, Taxpayer Protection Initiative.)

(This space purchased for \$300 in accordance with ORS 251,255.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

CAN NEW LAYERS OF GOVERNMENT SPEND YOUR DOLLARS BETTER THAN YOU?

The Oregon Supreme Court has ruled that urban renewal bonds must be included under Measure 5 tax limits, but this Constitutional change will put past, present and future urban renewal bond debts OUTSIDE the limits for all time.

Urban renewal bonds may be sold for a very wide range of projects, and a property owner may be subject to more than one taxing project at a time. All homes and business property in the city or county being assessed for the urban renewal project will be subject to these taxes outside current limits. This could add significantly to your current property taxes.

Urban renewal agencies can schedule elections any number of times until projects are passed. Once the bonds are voted and sold, they cannot be canceled by any subsequent vote, but must be repaid.

Your city could have a large number of urban renewal projects at any one time. Your county could also have a large number of projects at the same time. You could be taxed on multiple city projects and multiple county projects at the same time. This could add significantly to your property tax statement.

Urban renewal bonds give potential special treatment to some properties and make many others pay the price. A county renewal agency may designate a project in a remote area and make the entire county pay. A city may build a facility that narrowly benefits one neighborhood and make a distant cross-town property taxpayer retire the bonds with a direct tax.

VOTE NO ON BALLOT MEASURE 1 FOR FAIR TAX TREATMENT.

(This information furnished by Cedric Hayden, State Representative, and the Honorable Ron Sunseri.)

(This space purchased for \$300 in accordance with ORS 251,255.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

MEASURE NO. 1 State of Oregon

ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

BALLOT MEASURE 1 IS A TRAP!

Ballot Measure 1 is being presented as a means of increasing local voter control of urban renewal spending. The truth is that they will have less control if this measure passes and if their city or county gives one-time approval of urban renewal projects.

That's the Trapi II local voters say "Yes" in just one election, then their urban renewal agency is free "from here to eternity" to issue urban renewal bonds (tax increment revenue bonds) and to add whatever taxes are necessary to repay those bonds without ever coming back to the voters.

If Ballot Measure 1 passes, urban renewal agencies will be using the same system used on November 1991 tax bills (before the Supreme Court ruled that it violated Measure 5). Under that system, the City of Tualatin's tax rate for urban renewal was just a few cents less than the rate for all other city operations combined! And, in one area of Hood River, the urban renewal tax rate was more than \$5.50 per \$1000 of assessed value. It makes no sense to limit taxes for essential non-school services and then have no limits on taxes for urban renewal!

Ballot Measure 1 was drawn up by clever urban renewal specialists who want NO restrictions on their spending authority and want to be higher in the pecking order than police and fire protection, community hospitals and even schools.

HERE ARE THE FACTS YOU NEED TO KNOW.

Right now, your city or county <u>already</u> have the authority to ask for voter approval of general obligation bonds for capital construction or improvements in an urban renewal plan.

Your city or county can issue revenue bonds to finance other aspect of an urban renewal plan, but the taxes to repay those bonds have to come out of the \$10 per \$1000 assessed value allowed under Measure 5.

If Ballot Measure 1 passes, your property taxes can skyrocket, and when that happens you'll be wondering whatever happened to property tax limitation. Don't allow the urban renewal agencies to realize their goal of, "One man, one vote, ONE TIME."

VOTE NO on Ballot Measure 1.

(This information furnished by Don McIntire, Protect Oregon Property Society - "P.O.P.S.")

(This space purchased for \$300 in accordance with ORS 251.255.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME THE LEGISLATURE DID YOU ANY FAVORS?

Ballot Measure 1 is brought to you by the same Legislature that promised you property tax relief for over 12 years but could never get its act together. But they sure can pull themselves together when it comes to clever schemes to increase your taxes.

The medicine the Legislature is asking you to swallow (property taxes to repay urban renewal debt without any stated or implied limit) is so bitter that they have coated it with a sugar coating of increased local voter control. But note that THEY wrote the Ballot Title and then by law disallowed any challenges in the courts to determine if it is a fair and honest description of the measure. Hey, when you got the muscle, why not use it?

Ballot Measure 1 IS NOT ABOUT LOCAL VOTER CONTROL. When the voters approved Measure 5 in November, 1990, they allowed for voter approval of general obligation bonds to pay for capital construction and improvements, whether part of an urban renewal plan or not. There is no need to change a word there.

But urban renewal agencies don't like general obligation bonds because they come with a number of safeguards to protect the taxpayers. Urban renewal agencies prefer their own kind of bonds (called tax increment revenue bonds) because they can use the proceeds to make 2% or 3% loans to certain enlightened developers. Or they can "assemble" many small properties (by condemnation if necessary) and sell the package—frequently at a loss—to some favored developer.

This is a very deep pool of taxpayer money that the agencies and the developers have been swimming in for about 30 years now, and they have been having withdrawal pains at the thought of losing their taxpayer subsidy. But it is absolutely necessary that the taxpayers keep a lid on these taxes or the entire benefit of Measure 5 could be lost.

In November, 1990, the voters of Oregon realized the Legislature would never provide property tax relief and they had the courage to trust themselves to do the job. Measure 5 is only 40% implemented and many taxpayers have felt substantial relief. Others will feel relief over the next three years. In short, Measure 5 is working on the path projected. The voters were right to trust themselves in 1990. Now the voters need to have the courage to stick with the original plan and not allow an inept Legislature to screw up the people's rational plan.

Continue to trust yourself. VOTE NO ON BALLOT MEASURE 1.

(This information furnished by Harry Alton, Executive Club, Gresham.)

(This space purchased for \$300 in accordance with ORS 251,255.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

MEASURE NO. 1 State of Oregon

ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

SAY THAT AGAIN, GRETCHEN.

This is a story about Portland, but similar stories probably could be told around the State.

The story was reported on page C4 of *The Oregonian* for Friday, April 16, 1993. It seems that Mayor Vera Katz, in preparing the city's budget for 1993-94, set aside \$1.5 million to help pay for outstanding urban renewal bonds in case Ballot Measure 1 should fail. Seems like a prudent thing to do.

However, City Commissioner Gretchen Kafoury was troubled by the message such prudent budgeting might send. As reported in the newspaper:

"But Commissioner Gretchen Kafoury said the set-aside could undermine the [pro-Ballot Measure 1] campaign. If voters figure the city can absorb the debt payments, she said, it could sink the measure—and a chance for Portland to build another redevelopment program."

Gretchen's message is as old as the hills: Let's spend every dime we can extract from the taxpayars so we can go back to them and tell them we're broke and we need new taxes. Gretchen is so anxious to get Ballot Measure 1 peased that she is ready to gamble with the city's fiscal stability in order to get more tax dollars. When will they learn'

Surely there are Gretchens sitting on just about every city council and every county court or commission in the State. Isn't it time to pound home the message we thought we sent with the passage of Measure 5 in 1990? Enough of this gadfly spending just for the sake of spending. Get serious with our money!

But we can't blame the Gretchens of the world for the half-million dollar campaign now being waged to get you to believe that Ballot Measure 1 is about local control rather than about increased taxing authority. A great deal of that money can be traced right back to the developers who, with the cooperation of the urban renewal agencies, find the values of their own properties enhanced by urban renewal projects. And so the world goes around.

There remains one protection against this unholy alliance of politician, developer and newspaper editor. YOU, the informed voter who will not be swayed by glitzy TV ads or "personalized" computer mailings. YOU can recognize the source of the material you see and hear, and YOU can determine who will profit if Ballot Measure 1 passes.

VOTE NO ON BALLOT MEASURE 1.

(This information furnished by Tom Dennehy, "P.O.P.S." - Protect Oregon Property Society.)

(This space purchased for \$300 in accordance with ORS 251.255.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the State of Oregon, nor does the state warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

A cassette edition of the Voters'
Pamphlet is available for Oregonians
who cannot read standard print due to
a visual or physical disability.

To order a cassette edition of the Voters' Pamphlet, please contact Vision Resources For Independent Living at 503-284-3339.



Three covered wagons crossing the plains of Umatilla County as part of "Westward Ho" pageant at the Pendleton Round-Up. This undated photo was taken by the S. Nelson Camera Shop. Photograph courtesy of Oregon State Library.

COUNTY ELECTION OFFICES

BAKER Julia Woods Baker County Clerk 1995 3rd St. Baker City, OR 97814-3398 523-8207 / \$ 523-8208

BENTON Dan Burk Dir, Rec/Elections Courthouse Corvaills, OR 97330 757-8756 / \$ 757-5846

CLACKAMAS John Kauffman Clackamas County Clerk Elections Division 825 Portland Ave. Gladstone, OR 97027-2195 655-8510 / € 655-1685

CLATSOP Lori Davidson Clatsop County Clerk Courthouse, 749 Commercial Astoria, OR 97103-0178 325-8511 / C 325-8511

COLUMBIA Elizabeth (Betty) Huser Columbia County Clerk Courthouse St. Helens, OR 97051-2089 397-3796 / € 397-3874

COOS Mary Ann Wilson Coos County Clerk Courthouse Coquille, OR 97423-1899 396-3121, Ext. 301 / \$ 396-3106

CROOK Della M, Harrison Crook County Clerk 300 E. 3rd Prineville, OR 97754-1919 447-6553 / (447-6553 CURRY Rensé Kolen Curry County Clerk P.O. Box 748 Gold Beach, OR 97444 247-7011, Ext. 223 / \$ 247-8440

DESCHUTES
Mary Sue (Susie) Penhollow
Deschutes County Clerk
Administration Bidg.
1130 N.W. Harriman St.
Bend, CR 97701
388-6547 / \$388-6547

DOUGLAS Gay Fields Douglas County Clerk P.O. Box 10 Roseburg, OR 97470-0004 440-4252 / § 440-6092

GILLIAM Rena Kennedy Gilliam County Clerk Courthouse Condon, OR 97823-0427 384-2311

GRANT Kathy McKinnon Grant County Clerk P.O. Box 39 Canyon City, OR 97820-0039 575-1675 / \$ 575-1675

HARNEY Dolores Swisher Harney County Clerk Courthouse, 450 N. Buena Vista Burns, OR 97720 573-6641

HOOD RIVER Sandra Berry Dir. Assess/Rec Courthouse, 309 State St. Hood River, OR 97031-2093 386-1442

JACKSON Kathy Beckett Jackson County Clerk Courthouse, 10 S. Oakdale Mediord, OR 97501-2952 776-7181 / € 776-7183 JEFFERSON Elaine L. Henderson Jefferson County Clerk Courthouse, 75 S.E. "C" St. Madras, OR 97741 475-4451 / L 475-4451

JOSEPHINE Georgette Brown Josephine County Clerk P.O. Box 69 Grants Pass, OR 97526-0203 474-5243 / § 474-5243

KLAMATH Evelyn Biehn Klamath County Clerk 316 Main St. Klamath Falls, OR 97601 883-5135 / \$883-4135

LAKE Karen O'Connor Lake County Clerk 513 Center St. Lakeview, OR 97630-1579 947-6006 / \$ 947-6007

LANE Annette Newingham Elections Division 135 E. 6th Ave. Eugene, OR 97401-2671 687-4234 / € 687-4320

LINCOLN
Dana Jenkins
Lincoln County Clerk
225 W. Olive St., Room 201
Newport, OR 97365
265-8611, Ext. 2348 / € 265-6611,
Ext. 2348

LINN Steven Druckenmiller Linn County Clerk 4th & Broadalbin Albany, OR 97321 967-3831 / \$967-3833 MALHEUR Deborah R. DeLong Malheur County Clerk 251 "B" St. W., Courthouse Box 4 Vale, OR 97918 473-5151 / 473-5157

MARION Alan H. Davidson Marion County Clerk Ejections Division 3180 Center St. NE, Room 240 Salem, OR 97301-4589 588-5041 / \$ 588-5610

MORROW Barbara Bloodsworth Morrow County Clerk P.O. Box 338 Heppner, OR 97836-0338 676-9061 / € 676-9061, Ext. 26

MULTNOMAH Vicki Ervin Dir./Eisctions 1040 S.E. Morrison Portland, OR 97214-2495 248-3720 / € 248-3729

POLK Linda Dawson Polk County Clerk Courthouse, Room 201 Dallas, OR 97338-3179 623-9217 / \$623-9217

SHERMAN Linda Cornie Sherman County Clerk P.O. Box 365 Moro, OR 97039-0365 565-3606

TILLAMOOK Josephine Veltri Tillamook County Clerk 201 Laurel Ave. Tillamook, OR 97141 842-3402 UMATILLA Tom Groat Umatilla County Clerk P.O. Box 1227 Pendleton, OR 97801 276-7111, Ext. 254 / \$ 276-7119

UNION R. Neille Bogue-Hibbert Union County Clerk 1100 "L" Avenue La Grande, OR 97850 963-1006

WALLOWA Charlotte McIver Wallowa County Clerk 101 S. River St., Rm. 100, Door 16 Enterprise, OR 97828-1335 426-4543, Ext. 16

WASCO Karen LeBreton Wasco County Clerk Courthouse, 511 Washington St. The Dalles, OR 97058 296-6159 / € 296-6159

WASHINGTON
Jerry Hanson
Assess/Taxation
155 N. 1st Ave., Suite B 10
Hillsboro, OR 97124
648-8670

WHEELER Judy Potter Wheeler County Clerk P.O. Box 327 Fossil, OR 97830-0327 763-2400

YAMHILL Charles Stern Yamhill County Clerk Courthouse, 535 East 5th St. McMinnville, OR 97128-4593 434-7518 / € 434-7519



REMEMBER – YOUR VOTED

BALLOT MUST BE RECEIVED IN

YOUR COUNTY ELECTIONS

OFFICE BY 8:00 P. M. JUNE 29 TO

BE COUNTED.

SECRETARY OF STATE Phil Keisling State Capitol Building Salem, Oregon 97310-0722 BULK RATE CAR-RT SORT U.S. Postage P A I D Portland, OR Permit No. 815

RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMER

voters' pamphlet



STATE OF OREGON SPECIAL ELECTION JUNE 29, 1993



Please RECYCLE this pamphlet with your newspapers