

**LANE COUNTY MEASURES ON NOVEMBER 2024 BALLOT  
STATE MEASURES ON WHICH THE LEAGUE HAS TAKEN A POSITION  
ADVOCACY IN A NONPARTISAN ORGANIZATION**

**Lane County November 2024 Ballot Issues<sup>1</sup>**

Note: These are summaries of the ballot measures. Links to measures are included as endnotes.

**MEASURES BASED ON CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Background:** Lane County government operates under a home rule charter approved by voters in 1962. In 2010, Lane County voters approved an amendment to the Charter directing the Board of Commissioners to convene a Charter Review Committee (CRC) for the purpose of reviewing and recommending changes or updates to the existing charter every ten years. The current CRC completed its work in October 2023 and presented a final report to the Board in October 2023. The Board held a work session and several public hearings. There were three sections of the Charter that were recommended for repeal because they were out of date and referred by the County Commissioners to the ballot. None of the measures would have a financial impact. These measures were referred unanimously by the Board of Commissioners

**Ballot Measure 20-359**

**Official title:** Repeal of Section 32 of Lane County Charter

**Background:** This section concerns spending limitations on the general fund. The section was established prior to current state laws and practices that govern spending by the county. It contains terms which are out of date and have shifted in meaning. Additionally, the County is out of compliance with some elements of this provision as they are past practices that are no longer applicable. The 2011 Charter Review committee also recommended repeal of this section

**Proposal**

The proposed amendment would repeal Section 32 of the Lane County Charter, which imposes specific limits on annual County expenditures. State laws governing county budgets would continue to apply, as appropriate.

**Supporters say:**

- Repeal of this provision is basically housekeeping because the provisions in the section are out of date.
- Failure to repeal the provision would require the County to continue to be out of compliance with practices that are no longer applicable.

**Opponents say:**

- There is no organized opposition to the measure and there was no public comment against the repeal of Section 32.
- The primary benefit to retaining the section would be as a historical artifact.

**Ballot Measure 20-360**

**Official title:** Repeal of Section 33 of Lane County Charter

**Background:** This section was included in the charter when Lane County owned East Alton Baker Park and refers to restrictions on the use and development of East Alton Baker Park. It was sold to the City of Eugene in 1993 following the passage of ballot measure 20-01 in 1992.

**Proposal**

The proposed amendment would repeal Section 33 of the Lane County Charter, which imposes restrictions on the use and development of East Alton Baker Park. Lane County no longer owns the land constituting East Alton Baker Park as it was sold to the City of Eugene.

**Supporters say:**

- This provision serves little purpose for the County because the County no longer owns the land.

- In addition, since East Alton Baker Park is now within the Urban Growth Boundary, its potential developable land may benefit from greater flexibility governing its use.

**Opponents say:**

- The value of Section 33 would be as a historical artifact.

**Ballot Measure 20-361**

**Official title:** Repeal of Section 34 of Lane County Charter

**Background:** This section was established at the same time that a companion provision to create a county level income tax was voted down. Thus, the Charter contains a provision that restricts how an income tax would be used but no county level income tax exists. Any future implementation of an income tax would be best served by the opportunity to define and determine parameters that suit that moment.

**Proposal**

The proposed amendment would repeal Section 34 of the Lane County Charter, which limits the rate of any Lane County income tax and directs how revenues are to be used; however, currently there is no Lane County income tax.

**Supporters say:**

- This section serves no modern purpose for the County.
- The County is out of compliance with some elements of this provision as they are no longer applicable.
- This section largely serves as a historical artifact and provides no or minimal value to the County.

**Opponents are silent.**

There is no organized opposition to this measure and no one spoke in opposition to it during the public hearings.

The fourth measure was referred by a majority of the County Commissioners

**Ballot Measure 20-362**

**Official title:** Amendment of Lane Charter to Revise Subsections Governing Redistricting

**Financial impact:** The cost for redistricting in 2021 was over \$45,700, not including staff time. Costs are estimated to be at least that in 2025.

**Probable Results of a Yes vote:** Requires formation of a citizens redistricting commission to develop new Board of Commissioner districts for the 2026 general election and thereafter in each year ending in number one. Requirements for a citizens redistricting committee, including the composition of the committee, would become part of the Lane County Charter. Charter Subsections 10(3)(d)) and 10(3)(e) would be amended or repealed to conform to the new subsection 10(4).

**Probable Results of a No vote:** No change in Subsections 10(3)(d)) and 10(3)(e) of the Lane County Charter. The existing maps will remain in effect until after the next census.

**Background: Independent Redistricting Committee (IRC)**

In 2021, an Independent Redistricting Committee (IRC) was adopted by ordinance and established in **Lane Code**. Representative maps of the wards or districts for most elected officials are drawn every ten years after the decennial census, and so the IRC was tasked with bringing forward 2-4 recommended maps to the Board of Commissioners, from which the Board selected one.

**Charter Review Committee (CRC)** In 2010, Lane County voters approved an amendment to the Charter directing the Board of Commissioners to convene a Charter Review Committee (CRC) for the purpose of reviewing and recommending changes or updates to the existing Charter every ten years. The current CRC completed its work and presented a final report to the Board in October 2023. The Board held a work session and several public hearings. The CRC made several recommendations to the Board including edits to Section

10.3.d and 10.3.e – to revise the redistricting process and establish the Independent Redistricting Committee in the Charter.

The recommendation from the CRC was to replace the sections of the **Lane County Charter** that said that the Board of Commissioners would draw new maps with the requirement that the Board of Commissioners create an Independent Redistricting Committee (IRC) if the Board initiated review of the population of each district required a modification of boundaries to ensure equal protection under the law. If so, an Independent Redistricting Committee (IRC) would be convened.

The CRC defined the size of the IRC, its transparency and equity, the required number of redistricting proposals, and the opportunities for public comment. Following the public comment, one redistricting proposal was to be submitted to the Board. The CRC recommended that the application procedure for the IRC be defined in Lane County **Code** rather than in the **Charter** to allow greater ease in modifying the process. The final presentation by the Charter Review Committee to the Board was on May 7, 2024.

However, on May 23, a letter was sent by William Gary, of the law firm Harrang-Long (H-L), on behalf of Stanton Long, which outlined two proposals for ballot measures on redistricting. The first measure described the process for forming a redistricting commission, elements of which are described in this ballot measure. The second proposal redefined the composition of the five districts. The H-L proposal also included the requirement that a second redistricting process occur in 2026. The proposals were submitted without the opportunity for public comment and appeared to be the work of a single individual rather than a committee.

Discussion during the Board meeting following submission of the letter included concerns by some commissioners with the 2021 redistricting plan, which had been drawn by a committee with public input and chosen by the Board at that time. Primary concerns expressed by those commissioners included the inclusion of parts of Eugene in all districts in the 2021 map.

The Board referred the proposal to the CRC for an accelerated review because of the short time line for a ballot measure to be on the upcoming general election ballot. The expedited review of the H-L letter by the CRC contained several unanimous recommendations, including that the Board not initiate a mid-cycle redistricting effort and that the only required qualification for membership to serve on the Redistricting Committee be current voter registration in Lane County. These recommendations were not accepted by a majority of the Board. The County Clerk expressed concerns about the demands placed on her office by the proposal for redistricting in 2026.

**Proposal:** The proposed amendment would add subsection 10(4) requiring formation of a citizens redistricting commission to develop new Board of Commissioner districts for the 2026 general election and thereafter in each year ending in number one. The citizens redistricting commission would consist of 15 members plus alternates. The power to adopt the final district maps would be transferred from the Board of Commissioners to the new redistricting commission. Eligibility requirements for citizens redistricting commission members would include:

- Registration to vote in Lane County;
- Could not be candidates for or holders of federal, state, county or certain local offices;
- Could not be a registered lobbyist;
- Could not be paid congressional, legislative, or county employee.
- Other requirements:

- Redistricting commissioners would be selected by lot at a public meeting from a pool of candidates from each Board of Commissioner district.
- Lane County would provide staff and resources to the commission to fulfill its obligations.
- Board of Commissioners would adopt regulations to implement the new redistricting commission.
- Charter Subsections 10(3)(d)) and 10(3)(e) would be amended or repealed to conform to the new subsection 10(4).

**Supporters say:**

- The inclusion of portions of Eugene in all five districts of the current map creates the possibility of all five County Commissioners residing in Eugene.
- Some supporters of the H-L proposal felt that the redistricting process in 2021 was affected by political influence.
- An independent redistricting commission that does not involve current commissioners in the selection of some members of the redistricting commission is more independent.

**Opponents say:**

- Accepting a proposal from a single individual at the very end of a deliberative process that began in October 2023 and involved multiple opportunities for public comment is inappropriate.
- The concern about having five commissioners from Eugene is unwarranted. There are approximately 276,000 registered voters in Lane County and an average district size of 56,000 voters. About 105,000 Eugene voters are distributed between the North and South Eugene districts, while the other approximately 20,000 Eugene voters are distributed between the other three districts, making them a small component of the voting population for those three districts, and making five commissioners seats filled by Eugene residents highly unlikely.
- This proposal creates an additional out-of-cycle redistricting process that is not budgeted and will take resources from actual priorities like housing and public safety.

*The LWVLC opposes this measure:* A majority of the commissioners are now seeking voter approval of an additional redistricting cycle in 2025. They are doing this against the advice of the Lane County Elections office, against the advice of their own appointed Charter Review Committee (CRC) and without public comment about the last-minute changes they made to the CRC's report for the ballot measure wording. Bringing this proposal to the public as part of a ballot measure without the public hearing and comment process is not transparent. Redistricting mid-census is highly unusual and ordinarily occurs only if the approved maps are challenged because of a perceived bias. The commission never appealed the recommendations and maps of the IRC in 2021 to either the Secretary of State or in court. Ordering a specific off-cycle redistricting is an unnecessary expense of county funds better used for actual county priorities. The County Charter serves as a governing framework for our county government, much like a constitution. This specific language will be obsolete almost immediately and will require a future vote to remove it.

**CITY BALLOT MEASURES**

**Ballot Measure 20-363 and 20-364 from Oakridge, referred by the Charter Review Subcommittee of the Oakridge City Council**

These two measures will replace outdated language in the current charter and improve the election process in Oakridge.

**Measure 20-363, New Charter Oakridge** recommends a new charter modeled on the League of Oregon Cities' 2018 model. Among the changes are a mandate for public comment at every city council meeting, along with a video recording where possible which is available to the public; a representative of the council and city staff will sign each check; a super majority vote is required by designation of a city ordinance as an emergency; the

city council will determine by ordinance how city records will be kept; and a lower threshold for citizens initiatives and referendums to get on the ballot will be established.

**Financial impact:** Passage may save Oakridge money since it will no longer need to pay a city attorney to interpret outdated language.

**Background:** The city of Oakridge has an outdated city charter with unclear language, making it necessary to regularly consult a city attorney at a high hourly rate. In Oregon, a group of citizens can reset a city's charter if fifteen percent of registered voters call for the new charter. An independent committee of city residents, called the Charter Review Committee, held open meetings in Oakridge for two years beginning in June 2022. They reviewed the existing city charter, using the League of Oregon Cities 2018 model charter, and updated and clarified language in the Charter. Every member of the review committee had to consent to include any proposal for the new charter. The Charter Review Committee published a draft of the new charter July 1, 2024, and hosted two public meetings to get citizen feedback. In August 2024 they brought the draft to the Oakridge City Council, which approved bringing it to the voters. With the proposed changes, the City of Oakridge Charter will more closely resemble the League of Oregon Cities' Model Charter.

**Supporters say:** The new city charter allows for more citizen participation and oversight of decisions. The language is clearer, and there will be less of a need to ask the city attorney to clarify provisions.

**Opponents say:** There is no need to change the city charter.

**Measure 20-364, STAR voting Oakridge** amends the Oakridge City Charter by replacing the current voting method for the city of Oakridge with STAR Voting in three election cycles (2024, 2026, 2028). After that, voters will choose whether or not to amend the city charter to use STAR Voting in every election of city officials.

**Financial impact:** Because this is a limited experiment and dependent upon funding from the State or non-profits to implement, the measure should have no financial impact.

**Background:** There are concerns in Oakridge about the current method of electing officials. The independent Charter Review Committee suggested implementing STAR voting for city elections when reviewing the City Charter, and the Oakridge City Council accepted the Committee's recommendation and voted to refer the ballot measure to voters to decide. In the current electoral method, plurality voting, the candidate with the most votes wins. Because there is no requirement that the winner get more than 50 percent of the vote and there are no primary elections, when there are three or more candidates it is possible for candidates to split the vote.

In STAR voting (Score Then Automatic Runoff), voters score each candidate on a scale of zero to five. During the "scoring round" of STAR Voting, the scores are totaled for each candidate, and the two candidates with the highest total scores advance as "finalists." In the immediate automatic runoff round, voter preference between the two finalists establishes which of the two finalists is the winner.

The Charter Review Committee considered Ranked Choice voting as an alternative to STAR voting, but determined STAR Voting was much better. The committee held two public hearings prior to city council passing the resolution to send this measure to voters. There will be three additional townhall meetings to educate voters on both measures before the election.

**Supporters say:** Electing officials using STAR voting would reduce voter polarization and reduce the possibility of spoiler candidates.

**Opponents say:** Oakridge would be one of the first cities to adopt the new voting method, opening its city to the possibility of lawsuits. There is also concern that the city moved too quickly to propose the method to voters without adequately informing voters or vetting other alternatives, like Ranked Choice Voting.

### **Ballot Measure 20-365 and 20-366 from Cottage Grove, referred by the Cottage Grove City Council**

These two measures address the backlog of \$35M in needed street repairs and maintenance.

#### **Measure 20-365, General Obligations Bonds to Fix Streets**

**Financial impact:** The estimated annual tax rate would be \$0.05 per \$1,000 of assessed value.

**Proposal:** would authorize the City of Cottage Grove to issue \$2,500,000 of general obligation bonds to fix streets. If the bonds are approved, they will be payable from taxes on property or property ownership. The

City would levy taxes on property ownership to repay the bonds for five years. If the bonds are issued, the City will establish a citizen oversight committee to ensure proceeds are used for the purposes indicated. The proceeds from the proposed bonds would be used to fund repairs to the following streets: Row River Road from Thornton to Currin Connector; Taylor Ave from Gateway to 6<sup>th</sup> Street; and Harrison Ave from Hwy 99 to R Street.

**Measure 20-366, Increase City Gas Tax to \$.09 per Gallon:**

**Proposal and financial impact:** would increase the city gas tax from \$0.03/gallon to \$0.09/gal. The City's gas tax is used exclusively to construct, reconstruct, improve, repair, maintain, and operate public highways, roads, and streets within the City. The proposed increase in the gas tax would create more revenue for those purposes. It is anticipated that the proposed measure will generate approximately \$750,000 per year, which the City will dedicate to street repair and maintenance.

**Supporters say:** The City of Cottage Grove has a backlog of \$35,000,000 in street repairs and maintenance. Approval of the proposed bonds (measure 20:365) or taxes (measure 20-366) will provide funds to the City of Cottage Grove to undertake some of those needed street repairs.

**Opponents say:** The community is small and includes residents on fixed incomes. The additional tax would place a burden on them.

**State Measures on which the League has a position<sup>2</sup>**

**Ballot Measure 117**

**Official Title:** Gives voters the option to rank candidates in order of preference; candidate receives majority votes in final round wins.

**Statutory Referral:** Measure 117 is a statutory amendment referred to voters by the 2023 Oregon Legislature

**Estimate of Fiscal Impact**

Measure 117 is estimated to cost the state government approximately \$0.9 million during the 2023-25 biennium. These costs will pay for the Secretary of State's needed staff and consulting services to begin carrying out the measure. In the 2025-27 biennium, the cost of the measure is estimated to reach \$5.6 million, covering continued staff and consulting services, as well as outreach and IT needs. Local government costs are less known. County clerks currently estimate that the measure will cost \$2.3 million initially. This funding will be used to improve technology, train staff, and test the new system. Every statewide election will cost an additional \$1.8 million for added printing and logistics. Software and maintenance contract costs will cost an additional \$0.4 million per year

**Result of Yes Vote:** A "Yes" vote gives voters the option to rank candidates in order of preference for specified federal and statewide offices. It establishes a process for tallying votes in rounds, with the candidate receiving the fewest votes in each round being defeated and votes for the defeated candidate going to the voter's next-highest-ranked active candidate. A candidate must receive a majority of votes in the final round of voting to win the election.

**Result of No Vote:** A "No" vote maintains the current voting system.

**Background:** Currently the election method Oregon uses to select a single winner restricts voters to selecting only one candidate for each open seat. The winner need not garner a majority of votes but simply the most votes. This measure allows for a majority winner by providing an option to rank more than one candidate, if desired, for any office; write-in candidate(s) are also allowed.

When votes are counted, if no candidate receives a majority of votes (50% plus 1 vote) of voters' first choices, the votes are tallied in automatic runoffs. The candidate receiving the fewest votes in any round is defeated. The ballots choosing that candidate become active for the voter's next choice (if they marked one). The runoff rounds continue until a candidate reaches a majority of the votes.

The measure, which would start with elections beginning in 2028, requires that a voter education program be established, involving community-based organizations. As the measure authorizes local governments to adopt the election methods for local offices, the Secretary of State would be required to offer guidance (formal or informal) regarding the method to local government/service jurisdictions and school districts. [See the “proposal section” for offices that are covered under the measure.]

### **Proposal**

This measure will change the current voting method for certain statewide offices in Oregon. Instead of a pick one election, in which a majority win is not required, it will adopt a method called Ranked Choice Voting. Voters will list their choices in order of preference. Only their active choice will count for any round. The final round will require a majority winner.

The change will take effect in 2028 and will be valid for both primaries and general elections. It will not include Oregon legislators (senators or representatives). It will include all elections in which voters throughout the state participate: US President and Vice President, US senators and representatives, Oregon Governor, Oregon Secretary of State, State Treasurer, State Attorney General, and State Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor and Industries.

The measure allows for special rules for electing multiple winners. It authorizes cities or counties to adopt ranked choice voting if not prohibited by their home charter. It includes provisions for culturally-appropriate, community-based education of voters by the Secretary of State.

### **Supporters say:**

- Measure 117 ensures that the final winner receives a majority vote. Conversely, in our current system a candidate can win with a very small percentage of the vote. When electing one winner, majority rule is considered a fundamental principle of a democratic republic.
- Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) campaigns tend toward more civility, since it benefits candidates to win additional support for second or further rankings beyond their base. This encourages less mud-slinging, more effort to reach consensus when governing, and more talk of policies rather than personalities.
- RCV allows voters to “vote their hopes, not their fears” without having to strategize how they vote. Voters can express true preferences, knowing further choices never hurt their favorite candidate, thus avoiding vote splitting and spoilers.
- Voters using a ranked ballot have more voice and more choices, with fewer wasted votes. RCV respects one person, one vote. It’s simply one *active* vote at a time.
- Your vote matters ONLY if a candidate has to campaign for it. RCV candidates need to campaign for all votes. It ensures a more meaningful ballot despite the leanings of where you live. Whether an urban Republican or a rural-farming Democrat, your vote will matter more. RCV has been used and proven around the world and in over 60 jurisdictions in the United States.

### **Opponents say:**

- Ranked Choice Voting is more difficult than our typical pick one elections and is only useful if more than two candidates are in a race. It may be easy to choose 1, 2, and 3, but voters may still be confused about the process. Can they pick just one? Can they give two candidates the same rank? What happens if they skip a ranking? And finally, how are the votes counted?
- All changes to our election system, whether difficult or simple, demand voter education for the public. This means increased cost for election officials to develop and disseminate materials.
- Views from the far right and far left tend to be overshadowed by the middle-of-the-road voter when RCV is used. Supporters of RCV tout this as a benefit, but those wishing to promote alternative perspectives and philosophies may see this system as unfairly favoring moderate voters.
- While most Oregon vendors of ballot-counting machines use equipment that can accommodate ranked choice voting, counties will still be charged implementation costs for software upgrades. Oregon

administers elections with machines disconnected from the internet, counts ballots and reports results at the county level, and conducts hand-counted post-election audits. Under Measure 117, counties would struggle to coordinate elections as additional rounds of counting are necessary. Hand counting ballots during audits would also become more complex.

- The measure does not include some of the most important elections within Oregon, namely Oregon state legislators, which include state senators and representatives.
- RCV can disadvantage parties, as when two Republican candidates ran against a Democrat in the 2022 race for US House in Alaska. The Republicans conducted an aggressive campaign against each other, with the result that the Democrat won in a state that historically votes Republican.

*The position of LWVOR:* With Ranked Choice Voting (RCV), campaigns tend to be more civil, since it benefits candidates to seek support beyond their base. A candidate must not only win a voter's first choice, but also appeal to those who would rank them 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup>. With RCV, candidates must court all voters. Tested and proven, RCV respects one person, one vote. It simply uses one ballot choice as the *active* vote at any one time and promotes "sincere" voting.

### **Ballot Measure 118: Oregon Rebate**

**Official Title:** Increases highest corporate minimum taxes; distributes revenue to eligible individuals; state replaces reduced federal benefits

**Initiative:** This measure is a statutory amendment

**Financial Impact:** The measure creates the Oregon Rebate program, which will be partially funded with a new corporate minimum tax equal to 3 percent of corporate sales above \$25 million. The rebate program will distribute the net revenues from the new tax to Oregon residents in equal amounts annually. Individuals who lose federal benefits because of the rebate will be held harmless with additional payments, which will come from the rebate revenue. According to the Legislative Revenue Office, following the initial phase-in, total biennial costs of the rebate program are expected to exceed new biennial income.

**Results of a Yes vote:** A "yes" vote increases corporate minimum tax on Oregon sales exceeding \$25,000,000; eliminates tax cap; distributes revenue to eligible individuals; state replaces any reduced federal benefits.

**Background:** Based on the use of federal supplemental income programs, Oregon has a relatively large population of low-income residents. One suggestion for helping to raise people out of poverty is through direct cash transfers, which is designed to alleviate poverty and potentially replace other need-based social programs.

This ballot measure is designed to provide a guaranteed income for Oregonians starting in 2026 through an increase of the corporate minimum income tax rate. The tax revenue would be redistributed to eligible citizens, which are those who have resided in Oregon at least 200 days in the previous calendar year, with exceptions for births or deaths. If the increase in income affects benefits in programs with income level cutoffs, the measure is designed to compensate for the loss of the benefits.

#### **Proposal:**

The measure proposes, in addition to current corporate taxes, a new corporate minimum tax of 3% on C and S corporations with corporate sales above \$25 million and the distribution of that new revenue to eligible citizens. Individuals with eligible dependents or wards receive the rebates for those dependents and wards. If rebates are not claimed, they will carry over to the following year, and if rebates are declined, the money will be allocated to services for senior citizens, health care, public early childhood education, and public kindergarten through grade 12.

The rebates paid under this measure are not subject to state tax and do not affect eligibility for state benefit programs. The measure directs the Department of Human Services to seek waivers if eligibility for federal services is affected by the rebate or to reimburse federal benefit participants for the reduction in their



benefits. The reimbursements are only to be funded by revenues from this measure. It applies to 2025 and later tax years and authorizes rebates to be paid beginning in 2026.

The analysis by the Legislative Revenue Office analysis of the measure concluded that the average rebate paid in 2026 (2025 tax year returns) was expected to be about \$1,160 per person, compared with projected rebates of \$1,605 and \$1,686 paid in 2027 and 2028, respectively.

However, the LRO analysis indicates that following the initial phase-in, total biennial costs of the rebate program are expected to exceed the new biennial revenue:

- Because the measure requires that the increased revenue is first used to pay administrative costs and fund the "hold harmless" provisions, with the remainder distributed to residents, any additional costs must come from the General Fund. This measure is predicted to decrease tax payments by roughly \$17 million per year. Additional costs include, for example, the requirement that taxes on motor vehicle fuels go into the highway fund and the requirement that the corporate kicker, which is expected to be large in the 2025-27 biennium because of the additional corporate tax, support K-12 education. These costs are not designated to be covered by the revenue from the new taxes.
- Estimated indirect impacts on personal income tax revenue are reductions of \$12 million in 2023-25, \$199 million in 2025-27, and \$207 million in 2027-29. S-Corporations, which are included in this measure, do not pay tax as an entity but rather pass the taxable income to their shareholders. Their incomes would be reduced by the additional tax. Simulations also suggest that wages will be slightly depressed.
- Lastly, changes to the economy are projected to reduce state revenue by roughly \$11 million in 2023-25, \$150 million in 2025-27 and \$400 million in 2027-29. The LRO estimates a 1.3% increase in prices of goods and services and reductions in jobs, wages and personal incomes, assuming that corporations will pass the extra cost to consumers. This would be inflationary.

**Supporters say:**

- Families who are struggling will receive a lifeline from the funds from this rebate.
- Studies show that recipients of funds from programs like these increase their expenditures on essentials like food, housing, and transportation and are more likely to visit a doctor or a dentist. They worked on average 1.3 hours less per week but remained engaged in the workforce.
- This tax, which is only on large corporations with sales of \$25M or more, will make corporations pay their fair share. Currently, many large corporations have effective tax rates in less than 1%.

**Opponents say:**

- The proposed tax is on sales, not profits, which makes it difficult for low-margin businesses like grocery stores to remain profitable, inevitably forcing price increases, which will be passed on to the consumer and could result in businesses leaving the state.
- Oregon is currently ranked 28<sup>th</sup> in terms of corporate taxes. If this tax passes, Oregon may be on the list of the "10 Worst Business Tax Climates," discouraging companies from moving to Oregon and encouraging current employers to leave.
- Government officials say the bill would be a tremendous strain on our state, including a potential impact of more than \$2.8 billion on state resources and deep cuts to important front-line services, like health care and public safety.
- Non-partisan research also indicates that Measure 118 would increase prices for consumer goods and slow Oregon's job growth.

*The position of LWVOR:* The League should oppose Ballot Measure 118. There are major unknowns, including whether the measure would only apply to corporations which are headquartered here or those which do business here. There could be significant unintended consequences for our state budget if corporations move to avoid the tax. The League supports a fair and equitable tax structure and we support policies which address the needs of low-income people. However, 118 is not the appropriate approach.

### **Non-partisanship and advocacy in the League of Women Voters**

From the LWVUS: The League advocates to **educate** and **take action** on public policy issues. Our actions are based on League **positions** formed through studies and member consensus at the local, state and national levels. The League takes action on an issue *only* when there is an existing League position that speaks to the cause. Advocacy is never conducted on behalf of a *candidate or political party*.

#### **Discussion questions:**

- 1) When the League takes a position on an issue, should the presentations of pro and con viewpoints be followed by the League's position, or should we wait until someone asks for it? When does education end and advocacy begin?
- 2) When either the state or local League takes a position on an issue, there are sometime unexpected consequences.
  - i) In measure 20-362, on redistricting, the League is part of a coalition opposing the measure. How should the League maintain its nonpartisan position in publicity in a coalition of more partisan organizations?
  - ii) Measure 117 on ranked choice voting has support from LWVOR. In the measure on STAR voting during the primary, that support was used by outside groups to undermine STAR voting support. Should LWVLC have taken a position on STAR voting to counter the state support if we supported STAR voting?

Material prepared by Nancy Mills, Beatrice McKenzie Lori Barker, and Barbara Klein and edited by Merle Bottke.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.lanecounty.org › residents › elections>

Ballot measure explanations for all Lane County and City measures can be found on the LWVLC website.

<sup>2</sup> [https://ballotpedia.org/Oregon\\_2024\\_ballot\\_measures](https://ballotpedia.org/Oregon_2024_ballot_measures)

Ballot measure explanations for all Oregon State measures can be found on the LWVLC website.