

Measure 37 Argument in Favor

VOTE YES FOR MEASURE 37

"Whether you own property or not you benefit from protecting property rights, just as you benefit from free speech whether you exercise that right or not". Thomas Sowell

That is why the framers included in the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution a protection for private property.. "**Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation**".

Government regulators tend to view the taking clause of the Fifth Amendment as an unfortunate obstacle. It is far easier for them to achieve their ends by taking from a few property owners than it is to tax all the voters to pay just compensation.

Government depends upon taxpayers to generate wealth and taxpayers depend upon security in their financial affairs (clear title for ownership). Therefore, **property rights need to be taken seriously and are essential to the generation of wealth upon which all government depends.**

George Washington said "Freedom and property rights are inseparable. You cannot have one without the other".

According to Saint Thomas Aquinas: "Private ownership of property is the best guarantee of a peaceful and orderly society for it provides maximum incentive for responsible stewardship". Our Oregon Century Farms are an excellent example of this.

This measure is an effort to require just compensation for government actions that diminish the value of private property. We recommend a YES vote.

Jerry A. Dyksterhuis, Farmer

Deanna Dyksterhuis, Farmer

Scott E. Dyksterhuis, Farmer

Gylan Mulkey

Gwendolyn J. Mulkey

Rita Swyers

(This information furnished by Deanna Dyksterhuis.)

Argument in Favor

The Current System Is Broken - And It Costs Everybody Money

The Dolan family urges you to support Measure 37

In 1987, we asked the City of Tigard for permission to expand our local plumbing store. The City agreed, but they then said they would not issue a building permit unless we gave them a significant portion of our property for a bike path.

We told the City that we would sell them the land they wanted for \$14,000, which was the fair market value of the land.

But the City said no, and told us that we would not get our permit unless we turned over our land for free.

We spent the next 10 years fighting the City through a maze of legal bureaucracy -- all over a \$14,000 strip of land. We went to the Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals, the Oregon Court of Appeals, the Oregon Supreme Court, the United States Supreme Court, and back down again.

Finally, after 10 years of fighting, the City paid for an easement across our land and paid our attorney fees. **The cost -- 1.5 million of your taxpayer dollars!!!**

That's 1.5 million of taxpayer dollars for land that we would have voluntarily sold to them for \$14,000. What a waste.

We support Measure 37 because it will cut down on endless litigation like ours. If Measure 37 would have been in place in 1987, the City of Tigard would have purchased our land for \$14,000, instead of fighting us every step of the way and eventually wasting \$1.5 million hard earned tax dollars.

What happened to our family is unfair --the current system forces ordinary Oregon property owners into years of costly and stressful litigation just to be compensated for what everyone agrees is fair.

Please help fix the system...Please vote Yes on Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Dan Dolan.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon Farmers Ask That You Vote Yes On Measure 37.

People work hard for their property. Whether a home or a saving account, your property is the result of hard work and effort. No one should be able to use a legal loophole to take away your property without compensation. Especially not government.

Over the past years we have seen state and local governments take the use and value of private property by using a loophole in the law. Sure, they tell you that you can fight them in court....but it will take years and your attorney fees alone will likely exceed the value of your property. That is not fair and they know you can't afford it.

Measure 37 closes the loophole and streamlines the process.

No one has the right to take private property without compensation, not even government - that is why we need Measure 37.

Josephine County Farm Bureau asks that you vote yes on Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Keith Nelsen, President, Josephine County Farm Bureau.)

Argument in Favor

Dorothy English

I am a Chief Petitioner for Ballot Measure 37. Some say I am the poster child for Ballot Measure 37.

My husband and I purchased our property in 1953. It was our dream to someday divide the property, give some of it to our children and grandchildren, and sell the remained for our retirement. We have always paid our taxes, and never been on any type of tax deferral.

Nevertheless, Multnomah County zoned our property as commercial forest land even though there isn't a commercial timber operation anywhere near our property. What's more, Multnomah County knows our property is mis-zoned, but refuses to do anything about it.

Oregon's land use system is supposed to be balanced and fair. It is neither. Multnomah County has made it perfectly clear to me, and many other property owners, that the county intends to be neither balanced nor fair.

Governor Kulongoski told Multnomah County that he sympathized with my problem and asked the County to work with me to help resolve my case.

But the County refused to help. Multnomah County Chairwoman Diane Linn even personally asked the Governor to veto a bill that would have restored some of the rights my husband and I had when we first purchased the property - that is how unfair Multnomah County has been.

Opponents of Ballot Measure 37 are trying to scare the voters into opposing this measure. Please do not believe their scare tactics. Ballot Measure 37 will help senior citizens like myself recover what has been stolen from us.

Oregon's land use system is in need of repair. Our elected leaders, community leaders, and newspapers, are unwilling to support the necessary changes. It's time for Oregonians to do the work ourselves. It is time we say "no" to the scare tactics and restore fairness and balance to the system.

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. Please vote yes on Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Dorothy English.)

Argument in Favor

THE OREGON HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATION ASKS FOR YOUR VOTE ON MEASURE 37

Measure 37 is Critically Needed

If you are like most Oregonians, your home and property is your most valuable asset.

What would you do if you were stripped of the value of your home by regulations that were changed overnight, without warning?

Unfortunately, this is an all too common occurrence in Oregon. Based on misguided notions of the public good, politicians and planners have created a never ending stream of new laws and restrictions that destroy your investment, your hopes, and your dreams.

This needs to stop!

Measure 37 is Homeowners' Insurance

We all buy home insurance to protect our property from floods, fires, and other natural disasters.

But you can't buy insurance to protect your home from unexpected changes in property regulations.

Measure 37 fills that gap, and doesn't cost a dime!

Ballot Measure 37 is a family's first and best line of defense for protection of their property.

No one should have to worry about their home and property being taken away by an overreaching government bureaucrat. It's your property, your hard work, and your investment.

Protect it by voting Yes on Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Leigh Foxall, Oregon Homeowner's Association.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon Family Farmers Ask For A Yes Vote on Measure 37:

The Voters Have Already Spoken: Government Should Not Be Able To Take Property Without Compensation

In November 2000 voters overwhelmingly voted in favor of Measure 7 which required compensation to property owners when government take private property. The Oregon Supreme Court threw-out Measure 7 on a technicality....Measure 37 restores the will of the Oregon voters.

The Current System Needs to Be Fixed

Currently government and property owners are forced to spend millions and millions per year in litigation and process. Property owners should not be required to submit application after application to the government to receive what they deserve.

Measure 37 corrects this problem and streamlines the process - this will save the property owners and taxpayers money.

The Current System Only Helps A Few... . Hurts Small Farmers

The only way to be treated fairly by the current system is to have the financial means to litigate, and therefore negotiate, with the bureaucracy. That's why you may see some big and corporate farmers opposing Measure 37...the current system works for the big guys.

Measure 37 will help small farmers, small property owners and the average homeowner when they face the power of government taking private property.

All of Us Work Hard For Our Property

If state or local governments want to take your property then they should be required to pay for it.

Measure 37 Is Simple

If you have any questions about Measure 37...just read the Measure. It is simple and straightforward. Measure is about restoring fairness to an expensive, broken process.

The Oregon Family Farm Association PAC asks you to vote yes on Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Larry George, Oregon Family Farm Association.)

Argument in Favor

Jim Watts

Until this year, I owned three parcels outside of Sisters. I paid a handsome price for each parcel, because I was able to build a house on each parcel.

Because I am disabled, and limited in the work I can do, I purchased these parcels as an investment for my retirement.

Unfortunately, with no warning or notice to me, the regulations on my property were changed. These changes took away my right to build a home on each parcel.

With the stroke of a bureaucrat's pen, my property was stolen.

And so, in 1998, I began a long odyssey to restore my rights. Finally, after five years of countless hearings, legal paperwork, meetings with lawyers, and multiple application fees, I got my rights back.

I was one of the lucky ones. Unlike so many other governments, Deschutes County worked hard to help correct the laws which stripped my property of its value.

So why did it take five years to get back what was stolen from me? Because one couple fought every effort I made to restore my rights. They even argued that my property was needed for farming because a neighbor had once grown marijuana on his property!

Opponents of Measure 37 falsely claim that Measure 37 will create a new and burdensome process. I fought for five years to restore rights that were taken from me. Isn't that a burdensome process?

Do you have five years and thousands of dollars available to fight for the right to live on your property? There is no process that is more burdensome or expensive than what we currently have in Oregon.

Measure 37 presents a streamlined process that treats all Oregonians equally. Had Measure 37 been in place when I purchased my property, I would not have had to go through five years of hell in order to restore my rights.

If Measure 37 passes, you won't have to.

Please support Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Jim Watts.)

Argument in Favor

STATE LEGISLATORS SUPPORT MEASURE 37

As your elected state legislators, we strongly support the passage of Measure 37.

We have all heard the heart wrenching stories of Oregonians whose hopes and dreams were destroyed by land use regulations placed on their property after they purchased it.

An elderly farmer loses the right to divide his farm to give to his children. A couple lose the right to live on their lot in a sub-division because their property has a "scenic view." A young family loses the right to put a swing set in their backyard because it would "disturb the natural area."

These types of examples, and many others, are why Measure 37 is so important. People work hard to save enough money to buy property. No one should take property without compensation - not even the government.

But more than that, Measure 37 provides an economic boost that Oregon so desperately needs. By allowing state and local government to return the property rights they have taken from Oregonians instead of paying compensation, Measure 37 allows Oregonians to use their land to create jobs, boost property and income tax revenues, and help fund essential government services. And this is all accomplished not through raising taxes, but by putting more faith in people and the private sector. What a concept!

The right to own and use property is what makes America the greatest country on Earth. Measure 37 protects that right. That's why we support it. We hope you will too.

Jackie Winters, State Senator
Steve Harper, State Senator
Bruce Starr, State Senator
Gary George, State Senator
Bill Fisher, State Senator

Charles Starr, State Senator
Roger Beyer, State Senator
Tim Knopp, State Representative
Linda Flores, State Representative
Gene Whisnant, State Representative
Dennis Richardson, State Representative
Jerry Krummel, State Representative
Donna Nelson, State Representative
Cliff Zauner, State Representative
Tootie Smith, State Representative
Jeff Kropf, State Representative
Gordon Anderson, State Representative
Susan Morgan, State Representative
Wayne Scott, State Representative

(This information furnished by David J. Hunnicutt, Family Farm Preservation PAC.)

Argument in Favor

SMALL BUSINESSES SUPPORT MEASURE 37

On behalf of the Oregon chapter of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), please join me in voting yes on Ballot Measure 37.

Small businesses are the heart and soul of Oregon communities. Small business owners are community leaders, volunteer coaches, mentors, and church leaders. NFIB/Oregon is dedicated to protecting the interests of small businesses throughout the state.

But over the years, small businesses have increasingly become the focal point for new and more burdensome regulations on our right to own and use property.

These regulations are often well intentioned but they have the effect of making it difficult or impossible for our members to stay in business. This hurts every Oregon community, especially our smaller towns.

You've probably heard some of the horror stories - the City of Portland demanding \$36,000 in fees from a restaurant owner who wanted nothing more than to move his restaurant across the street, or the City of Tigard demanding a \$37,000 "traffic impact fee" from a company that wanted to improve its offices for its existing employees, but would not create any new traffic.

Making it more difficult for businesses to grow and expand hurts our economy and our public sector.

Fortunately, Measure 37 will help ease that burden. Measure 37 levels the playing field between private citizens and that small but powerful segment of state and local government that wants to impose more and more regulations on our private property.

And Measure 37 contains important exceptions to help maintain well-planned and livable neighborhoods.

Small business owners should not have to live in fear of having the rug pulled out from under their feet by new property restrictions that destroy their property's value and make it harder for their business to survive.

Its your property, its your investment, and its your hard earned money. Measure 37 protects that investment.

Please vote yes on Measure 37.

(This information furnished by J.L. Wilson, National Federation of Independent Business/Oregon.)

Argument in Favor

Jim Parker

My wife and I own a home on 1.5 acres located in Beaverton, Oregon. We have owned the property for 39 years. When we purchased our home, one of the unique features was a creek on the property. Approximately four years ago the City of Beaverton came up with a plan that was intended to protect wildlife habitat in the stream.

Originally, Beaverton's plan was to redirect the creek to an area of my property that was considered to be a wetland. However, the city changed its mind and diverted the creek elsewhere, along a nearby road. As a result, the creek bed on my property is now dry and the wetland is hardly wet at all. But this was just the beginning of our problems.

Despite the fact that my property no longer has an active creek running through it, nor does it have a "wet" wetland on it, Metro recently mapped our home as "wildlife habitat" and is considering placing severely restrictive environmental overlay zones on nearly all of our property.

The irony of our situation should not be lost. There is no "wildlife habitat" on our property because the City of Beaverton dried up the creek! Nevertheless, we are going to lose all of our rights because the government wants to protect wildlife habitat! If the government wants to protect habitat, the City of Beaverton shouldn't have dried up the creek.

And who is going to pay for this? My family. We are going to have to bear the burden of the cost of preserving this "habitat". We won't be allowed to "disturb" any of our property because doing so would disrupt the non-existent wildlife on the dry creek bed.

Ballot Measure 37 will protect people from ridiculous regulations by protecting the rights you had at the time you bought your property. Please join

me in supporting Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Jim Parker.)

Argument in Favor

Deschutes County Farm Bureau

Yes On Measure 37!

Measure 37 is very simple. If government takes your property, then government should pay for it.

Just because government has found a loophole, that doesn't mean that Oregon voters should allow property owners to continue to lose property without compensation. To fight these "takings" in court, it takes years of expensive litigation, which they know we cannot afford.

State and local governments realize that Oregon's family farms and ranches are already under great financial pressure and we can't fight back.

It shouldn't cost private property owners thousands of dollars in litigation and attorney fees to receive what is fair.

These "takings" are happening to farmers, ranchers, and homeowners all over Oregon...and the system needs to be fixed.

Oregon voters overwhelming approved Measure 7 in 2000...but the Supreme Court threw it out on a technicality. Measure 37 will make it clear that Oregon voters want property owners to be treated fairly.

Please join the Deschutes County Farm Bureau in voting YES on Measure 37.

Thank you.

(This information furnished by Matt Cyrus, Deschutes County Farm Bureau.)

Argument in Favor

Matt Roloff

We own a 25 acre pumpkin patch and peach orchard in rural Washington County. My wife and I are limited in our ability - not by our desire but rather by our physical limitations. I am the Past-President of the Little People of America, an association dedicated to improving the lives of little people across the country. My wife and I purchased our farm with the hopes of raising our children in a rural setting.

On our farm we grow pumpkins and peaches, depending on the season. We have built some play structures including an Old West Town, a Pirate Ship, a Treehouse, and a Castle, for our kids, but they are also available to the public during the harvest season. Over the years, our farm has become a regular spring and fall destination for families who want to make a day out of selecting their pumpkins or picking peaches.

One of our competitors in Washington County filed a complaint and demanded that Washington County shut down our farm. I will not back down, and because of that, Washington County continues to try to stop our family, despite the fact that numerous farms across the county engage in exactly the type of business practices that we do.

Aren't Oregon's land use laws supposed to protect farms? Apparently not.

That's why we support Ballot Measure 37. If the government wants to apply the law to some farmers but not others, then we all need protection from the government. What happens when the government doesn't like you? Right now there is no protection in the law. Ballot Measure 37 gives you that protection.

Please join us in supporting Ballot Measure 37. Protect rights for all Oregonians, not just those the government likes.

(This information furnished by Matt Roloff.)

Argument in Favor

OREGON EMPLOYERS SUPPORT MEASURE 37

As some of Oregon's largest employers, we support Ballot Measure 37.

Our companies employ thousands of Oregonians throughout the state. We understand that a fundamental key to a healthy economy is a respect for the ability of every citizen to own and use property.

Without this ability, our companies would not be successful, we would not have jobs for our employees, and we would be unable to serve our local communities.

Unfortunately, the ability to own and use property in Oregon is under constant attack, more so than in any other state in the United States.

The delicate balance between needed property regulations and free enterprise is skewed to the point where it is hard for Oregon companies to

compete with our neighboring states, much less in a global marketplace. This is one reason why Oregon consistently ranks among the states with the highest unemployment rate.

And that is why Measure 37 is so critically needed.

Measure 37 strikes a balance between regulation and the free market. It ensures that no Oregon citizen or business, large or small, is singled out to bear the burden of property restrictions that are designed to benefit us all.

At the same time, Measure 37 does not apply to regulations to protect the public health and safety, like pollution control laws or health and safety codes.

Without Measure 37 and the additional protection for property owners it provides, there will be less opportunity for businesses to grow and expand in Oregon. That hurts us all, and hurts our schools and other vital public services, which depend on private enterprise for funding.

We are proud of our Oregon heritage and proud to endorse Measure 37. Please vote Yes on 37.

Aaron U. Jones, President, Seneca Sawmill Company
Michael A. Fahey, President, Columbia Helicopters
Robert Freres Jr., Freres Lumber Co. Inc.
Joan Austin, Executive Vice President, A-dec, Inc.
Steven D. Swanson, Swanson Group, Inc.

(This information furnished by David J. Hunnicutt, Family Farm Preservation PAC.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon Citizens For A Sound Economy PAC
Urges You To Vote YES On Measure 37

Oregonians work hard for their property - if government wants to take private property government should pay for it.

Measure 37 Will Stop the Hidden Tax

Oregon's state and local governments have found a loophole that allows them to take private property without compensating the owner. The only option is for the property owner to sue, spending thousands of dollars in litigation fees. This is unrealistic.

Because people cannot afford to fight, government gets their property for free. That's wrong. Taking property and destroying people's investments is an unfair, hidden tax on average Oregonians.

Measure 37 Will Help the Economy and Increase Jobs

Many businesses are afraid to build in Oregon when we have a system that can take private property without compensation. Measure 37 gives security to property owners, so they know they can use their property for what it is zoned for. That will attract new businesses to Oregon and create more jobs.

Measure 37 Will Save Taxpayers Money and Streamline the Process

It costs hundreds of thousands of dollars to challenge an unfair property regulation today. These challenges clog up the judicial system, cost the taxpayers money, and create years of frustration.

And even when the local government wants to help, one dedicated obstructionist can delay the process for years. For example, one property owner in Deschutes County asked the County to correct a zoning mistake that nearly eliminated the property owner's ability to use his land, and destroyed its value. When the County attempted to correct its error, one private citizen created roadblocks to the County efforts. It took nearly six years to fix an error that should have been fixed overnight.

Measure 37 will streamline the process and reduce costs to property owners and taxpayers. We strongly urge taxpayers to support Measure 37.

Oregon Citizens For A Sound Economy PAC

(This information furnished by Russell Walker, Oregon Citizens For a Sound Economy PAC.)

Argument in Favor**Tim and Casey Heuker**

On December 31st, 2000, we were the proud owners of a beautiful three-bedroom home with an unobstructed view of the Columbia River. On January 1st, 2001, our home burnt to the ground.

After recovering from the shock of losing our home to fire, we immediately applied for a building permit. Our permit was originally approved by Multnomah County.

We thought everything was finished. But our nightmare was just beginning.

The Columbia River Gorge Commission, along with a group calling themselves the "Friends of the Gorge," began tormenting our family in a fight which has taken three years, thousands of dollars, and placed considerable emotional strain on our family.

And why did they fight our application? Because they wanted us to plant over \$100,000 in new trees and shrubs in front of our home so that it couldn't be seen from the river.

And all we wanted to do was rebuild our family home.

It is unbelievable to us that we were treated this way. Our nightmare lasted over three years and cost us thousands of dollars. How can anyone believe that this is fair?

A simple, easy to understand, process such as such as Ballot Measure 37 will allow homeowners like us to avoid a three-year delay simply because we want to rebuild our home.

Measure 37 is homeowner's insurance from delay, stall tactics, and costly litigation.

Please join us in supporting measure 37, and protecting the rights of homeowners in Oregon.

(This information furnished by Tim Heuker, Casey Heuker.)

Argument in Favor**Oregon Cattlemen's Association Supports Measure 37****Measure 37 is needed to help the environment and the economy**

Unlike most industries, we make our living from the land. As a result, we have a keen interest in preserving our property and being good stewards of the land, so that we can provide the public with quality Oregon grown beef.

But too often, well-intentioned but misguided politicians create new laws and regulations which make it harder for us to use our land and stay in business. Rather than helping the environment, these regulations hurt the environment, as more and more beef is imported from third world countries where people don't own their land and have no incentive to protect it.

Measure 37 protects our property rights, protects our investments, and makes sure that politicians think about the impact of new regulations on all Oregonians, including property owners.

Measure 37 reduces costly litigation

Measure 37 sets-up a straightforward process to require government to pay landowners when newly created laws or regulations cause a loss in value to their private property. Presently, the Oregon Constitution states that state government must pay if it "takes" private land for the public benefit. But "takings" law is so convoluted that there is little hope of compensation when government regulations reduce the value of private property.

A restored balance that is fair.

Ultimately this state must seek to ensure a balance between environmental and economic concerns in our land use decisions. Measure 37 restores that balance and protects property owners. New land use restrictions will still be an option, but under Measure 37 landowners won't be asked to bear the entire cost of those restrictions.

Measure #37 brings much needed balance and fairness to the process.

The Oregon Cattlemen's Association urges you to support Measure #37

(This information furnished by Coy Cowart, President, Oregon Cattlemen's Association.)

Argument in Favor**Toni Beattie**

My husband and I own 31 acres in North Plains that we purchased in 2000. Our land is zoned commercial forest and it has a house on it that was built around 1961. We purchased the property with the intent to operate a horse boarding and lesson facility.

My husband and I have applied for a replacement dwelling on our property. Once our application is approved, we must disable the existing dwelling. In order to provide proper care to boarding horses, we thought it wise to turn the older dwelling on our property into caretaker house. This is where our problems began.

In order to have two dwellings on my property, we needed to rezone the property from commercial forest to farmland. And we had to show that we could make \$80,000 a year boarding horses! If I can make \$80,000 a year boarding horses, I would not have the need for caretaker. I would be able to hire people, outside employees, to come in and care for the horses.

My husband and I want to operate a small farm on our farmland with a caretaker. But Oregon land use laws are not allowing us to do so. The only a reasonable option we have left is Ballot Measure 37, which will restore our rights, and be fair for everybody. Please join me in voting yes on Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Toni Beattie.)

Argument in Favor

OREGONIANS IN ACTION URGES A YES VOTE ON MEASURE 37

Treating people fairly is a foundation of our country.

If you are like most voters you know that government is required to pay you if they take your land - in fact, its required by the Constitution.

Most of the time, government complies with the Constitution and pays for what it takes.

But sometimes, instead of paying for what it wants, government decides that it can simply adopt a law that makes it impossible for a landowner to use his land.

This is like telling your neighbor he can't live in his house, and then offering to buy it from him at pennies on the dollar.

In order for a landowner to challenge a government regulation that takes away the value of his property, a landowner must fight a long and costly court battle. This is fine for large corporations or a few wealthy land barons.

But the thought of paying lawyers hundreds of thousands of dollars to fight a court battle for your home or land is too much for the average American family. Most people give up before they ever get started.

That's why Measure 37 is important.

Measure 37 will guarantee that you are treated fairly by the government. If they want your land, that's fine, provided they pay you for it.

Simple, understandable, and fair. That's what Measure 37 is all about.
Please vote yes on Measure 37.

(This information furnished by David J. Hunnicutt, Oregonians In Action.)

Argument in Favor

Barbara and Eugene Prete

We are two of the chief petitioners for Ballot Measure 37. In addition to being chief petitioners, we are also victims of Oregon's land use system.

We have been married for 42 years. Gene is a retired Lt. Col., having served 21 years in United States Army.

Barbara's grandfather immigrated from Norway to Oregon as a logger. In 1989, we decided to travel Oregon and visit the areas logged by Barbara's grandfather. While traveling through Sisters, we decided to retire there. In 1990, we purchased property in the Sisters area with the intent to build a retirement home for us and our horses.

The Deschutes County Hearings Officer's decision summarizes what Oregon's land use system has done to us:

The applicants purchased the property in 1990 with the intent of building a home on it. The hearings officer is aware that at the time the applicants purchased the property, the county routinely approved conditional use permits for nonfarm dwellings on these types of parcels. However, in the early 1990s, partly as a result of an enforcement order issued by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) requiring the county to enforce more rigorous sighting standards for nonfarm dwellings, approval of nonfarm dwelling conditional use permits became more difficult.

The hearings officer acknowledged that we were willing to take substantial steps toward mitigating the perceived effects caused by our home. Nevertheless because a bureaucrat in Salem decided to take away our right to build a home, only our horses are allowed to live on our property.

That was 11 years ago. We still don't have the right to build a home on our property, even though we had that right when we bought the property. Our dreams have been taken from us. All we want to do is live on our property.

Measure 37 will restore and protect the rights of Oregonians. Please join us in voting yes on Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Eugene Prete, Barbara K. Prete.)

Argument in Favor

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SUPPORT MEASURE 37

As County Commissioners, we support Measure 37.

Unlike other states, where local communities plan their own urban neighborhoods and rural areas, a large percentage of our planning laws are mandated by state agencies and the legislature.

As a result, we are often hamstrung by statewide, centralized planning laws and rules that have devastating impacts to the property owners in our counties.

Whether it's telling a farmer he has to make \$80,000 in order to live on his land, prohibiting a rural church from being too close to town, or watching

a business leave the community because of endless permit delays, we see the "on the ground" impacts of ever increasing property restrictions in ways that state bureaucrats could never imagine.

These ever changing rules and laws create fear among the community, and discourage investment. Why would a business build a new plant or office if they knew that the rug could be pulled out from under their feet before the project is even completed?

Measure 37 will stabilize our planning system, ensure that property owners don't lose their life savings at the stroke of a pen or on the whim of a mid level manager in Salem, and give our citizens more control over their own lives.

We like that, because we believe in the private sector, and in our citizens, neighbors, and friends.

Measure 37 restores lost opportunities, and returns more control over private property to where it belongs - the people.

Please join us in voting yes on Measure 37.

John Lindsey
Harold Haugen
Jack Walker
Anna Morrison
Dan Van Slyke
Kathy George
Leslie Lewis

(This information furnished by David J. Hunnicutt, Family Farm Preservation PAC.)

Argument in Favor

Gary Dye

I bought a 16,000 square-foot lot, zoned R-10-c, in Southeast Portland. This zoning designation requires that a lot be at least 10,000 square-feet to build a home. The "c" indicates a conservation overlay zone. When the property was first purchased, this designation didn't carry many restrictions, so building a modest home seemed pretty straightforward.

After years of hard work and saving, I eagerly went to get my building permit. The City of Portland, however, had other ideas. In the time since my purchase, the City placed more and more restrictions on the property, ultimately converting it into a wildlife habitat reserve: over 2/3 of the property set aside for the City, less than 1/3 left for me!

Conforming to the City's new restrictions, the design of my modest 3-bedroom home repeatedly underwent extensive and costly changes. Even after these changes, the property can't be fenced (protecting my home from intruders, providing my kids a safe place to play, or giving my dog some running room), there is very little front or side yard, and the back "yard" is only 5 FEET deep.

Most alarming, the City's restrictions contradict the Fire Bureau's recommendation of a 30-foot buffer between homes and dense vegetation. The City won't allow this buffer, subjecting my home and family to the threat of urban wildfires. I'm prohibited from "disturbing" trees, brush, or even WEEDS without repercussions from the City.

I would sympathize if the property contained old-growth trees, a stream, eroding slopes, or endangered species habitat, but it does not - it contains only AREA that the City wants for itself. The City seizes land for free while the property owner bears huge cost increases for design, construction, and additional regulatory fees. Yes, I must pay the City a fee for taking my land, increasing my costs, compromising my home, and endangering my family!

Approval of Measure 37 provides much-needed control over this currently abused process.

(This information furnished by Gary Dye.)

Argument in Favor

SENIORS AND FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN - IF YOU WANT TO KNOW WHY MEASURE 37 IS IMPORTANT, JUST ASK METRO

Metro, the Portland area regional government, is currently in the process of adopting new regulations that will place thousands of acres of privately owned land into "wildlife" and "riparian area" zones, regardless of your concerns or the wishes of your city or county government.

As a property owner, should you be concerned about these new regulations? **Here's what Metro has to say:**

"Real property is one of the largest economic investments many people make and regulations affecting property are an important and sensitive social issue. For residential land in particular, a regulatory program could impact personal financial security or the expectation to maintain, develop or redevelop land within the existing regulatory framework. Regulations that result in reductions to property value may affect people's ability to draw on the equity in their homes to fund retirement, education, and other activities." (Staff Report, Resolution No. 04-3489, August 12, 2004).

Metro is right. When you bought your home, did you have any idea that the rules could be changed to take away rights that you paid for? Most people don't know until it is too late.

That is why Measure 37 is important. Measure 37 allows Metro to continue to adopt new regulations, **but only if Metro is willing to pay for what**

it takes. That's only fair.

No property owner should have to worry that their retirement, their children's education, or their personal financial security will be destroyed by well-intentioned but misguided laws. Measure 37 will make sure that this doesn't happen. Please join us in voting Yes on Measure 37.

(This information furnished by David J. Hunnicutt, Oregonians In Action.)

Argument in Favor

Robert and Marilyn Lowery

We live in Keizer, Oregon, on property that has been in the Lowery family since 1946. We have raised our family here. Our son was born in our house. We have operated our family nursery here. This property is truly our home.

Our property is located in an area that is considered prime commercial real estate. Already, the city of Keizer has approved plans to take our property and give it to a private party so they can build a Krispy Kreme donut shop on the place where our home currently stands. The master plan approved by the city of Keizer makes immediate short term plans for our property even though we did not give the city the permission to do so. Right now we are locked in and can't get out.

In other words, it is as if the city or county you live in decided the property your house currently sits on would be better used as a bank, or a restaurant, or a Krispy Kreme donut store, and the city or county tells you that the moment you disturb the property you must instead build that bank, that restaurant, or that Kristy Kreme.....

Without ever asking you!

Oregon's land use laws are being abused every day. Property owners across the state are being subjected to onerous regulations which devalue property, and in cases like ours, strip property owners of all their rights. We are being bullied by the city because the city knows we have no protection.

Yet.

Ballot Measure 37 will protect property owners from actions of the government that take your property without your permission by "freezing" the rights you had at the time you purchased your property. Ballot Measure 37 is common sense legislation that will protect you from the kinds of tactics we have been subjected to.

Please join us in supporting Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Robert Lowery, Marilyn Lowery.)

Argument in Favor

Jackson County Farm Bureau Asks For A Yes Vote For Common Sense

Dear Fellow Voters:

Small family farmers all over Oregon depend on using their property to make a living - and we cannot afford the current system where government can take the value and use of property without compensation.

It sounds shocking to people who are not familiar with the loophole that allows government to take property without paying for it - but that is why we need Measure 37.

Measure 37 is about fairness.

We all work very hard for our property, and if government wants to reduce the values of our property then government should pay for it.

If state and local governments are allowed to continue to take advantage of this unfair loophole then every property owner and every homeowner will have to worry about the security of their investment.

Please join Jackson County Farm Bureau in supporting Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Ron Bjork, Jackson County Farm Bureau.)

Argument in Favor

Tater Patch Quilts

We are the owners of Tater Patch Quilts, a small quilting store located in Merrill, Oregon. Our store, started in 1996, is a unique store which offers quilting supplies to customers all over the country. Our unique location allows us to market our products to Oregonians and Californians.

We own property right along the Oregon-California the border. The property is located next to a state highway.

On our own property, we decided to erect a small sign advertising Tater Patch Quilts. By the way, our sign is right next to a "Welcome to Oregon" sign.

Even though our sign is on our own property, the State of Oregon wants us to tear it down because signs promoting businesses are prohibited on our property, no matter how big or small. If the state can welcome visitors, why can't I welcome people to my store?

I can't believe how difficult the state wants to make it for Oregon businesses to survive.

What is most insulting is that the State of Oregon's sign still remains.

Ballot Measure 37 will restore rights Oregonians have held near and dear for decades. Please join us in restoring property rights. Please vote Yes on Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Lee McKoen, Diane McKoen, Robin King.)

Argument in Favor

Phillip DuFresne

I own Big Bear Market. For those of you who are familiar with the Historic Columbia River Highway, you are also likely familiar with our market.

I have been privileged to operate the market for many years. The market has been a part of the community for over thirty years. As you can imagine, over the years the business grew and it became necessary to provide additional services to my customers.

Each time we added onto our building were never informed by Multnomah County that our building actually violated the County's code. In fact, the last time we added onto our building in 1994, the County's planner said our building was in full compliance with the County's code.

And then tragedy struck Big Bear Market in 2003. Part of our building burned to the ground. When the flames were extinguished one would have thought our nightmare was over and we would be allowed to put our lives - and our business - back together. One would be wrong. The fire was only the beginning of our troubles.

Despite the fact that Multnomah County told us in the past that our building was in compliance with the County's code, a new planner at Multnomah County with a political agenda felt otherwise. Despite the fact we had received approvals for our past additions, the County was not going to let us rebuild our business because the rules had changed.

Through no fault of our own tragedy struck the business, and now the County is doing everything it can to see to it that my business remains destroyed, and they are using Oregon's land use laws as their torch.

Ballot Measure 37 will restore fairness and balance to a system dominated by fear and oppression. Ballot Measure 37 will protect small businesses like our from the political will of a few unelected bureaucrats.

Please join me in voting yes on Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Phillip DuFresne.)

Argument in Favor

We are the chief petitioners for Ballot Measure 37. This statement is provided in order to instruct and aid the Oregon courts in determining the legislative intent behind Ballot Measure 37, and avoid misinterpretation of the intent of this law, as Oregon courts are known to do.

Voters are told that Ballot Measure 37 creates a large bureaucracy and red tape for property owners. Such claims are false. Ballot Measure 37 does not require any governmental unit to adopt any procedures for addressing Ballot Measure 37 claims. No applicant is required to follow a process conjured up by government. The measure makes this clear. All a property owner has to do is submit a letter or other communication demanding use or just compensation for his property - nothing more. There is no requirement that the state government or the local government adopt any new processes.

Second, voters are being told that the definition of "owner" is ambiguous. The term "owner" includes the current owners of the property. If the current owner sells an interest in her property, so long as the current owner still has a current possessory interest, or a reversionary interest in the property, the provisions of Ballot Measure 37 apply using the date the current owner acquired the property. Only if a current owner sells all of her interest in a piece of property does the date of acquisition change for purposes of determining what regulations are subject to Ballot Measure 37 protections.

Finally, opponents of Ballot Measure 37 are trying to scare voters into thinking the measure will prevent the state government and local governments from enacting nuisance abatement laws. This is incorrect. Nuisance abatement laws are exempt from Ballot Measure 37 protections, but again, a law that is currently considered a regulation of land use under Oregon law cannot be re-characterized as a nuisance abatement ordinance in order to avoid Ballot Measure 37.

Please vote Yes on Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Dorothy English, Barbara Prete, Eugene Prete.)

Argument in Favor

Ruth Pruitt

I purchased my property in Portland over ten years ago. At the time I purchased my property, it was approximately 3.47 acres of land that could be used for industrial or commercial development. My property is prime industrial and/or commercial real estate. It would seem logical, then, that the governor and the City of Portland would want to encourage development on my property.

As you can imagine, the city of Portland wants nothing to do with industrial or commercial development, especially not on my property.

My parcel is not developed. Sometime in late 1993, the City of Portland began slowly - - a death by a thousand cuts - - encroaching on my property, using easements, zoning overlays, and environmental overlays, taking away my ability to use my own land. Because of the regulations imposed by the city, of the original 3.47 acres of land that I own, only one-half acre of my land is actually usable.

But wait, there is more.

To make matters worse, the City of Portland requires 3.3 feet of wetland mitigation for every 1 foot of development. As a result, it will be impossible for me to do anything on my property except leave my property in "its natural state".

I have had everything taken for me. The entire value of my property has been taken from me by the city of Portland for the public's benefit, but I am being forced to pay for it by myself. The city of Portland has stolen my life savings from me.

When Enron steals your life savings, it's considered theft.

When the City of Portland steals your life savings, its called "new regulation."

Ballot Measure 37 simplifies the process, restores our rights, and most importantly protects the life savings of Oregonians. Please join me in voting yes on Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Ruth Pruitt.)

Argument in Favor**Ruth Grimsrud**

My family has owned property in rural Yamhill County for several years, since 1950 to be exact. In 1997, my father passed away and my sister and I inherited the remainder of the family property. Because of the costs associated with settling my father's estate, my sister and I decided to divide the property, sell one parcel to settle the estate, and keep one parcel for each of us with the intent that we would build homes on our property.

When we divided the property in the year 2000, we specifically described the access points each new parcel would have. **The county approved our plans**, including the new access points for each parcel. We thought the matter was finished.

I was wrong. I am the last person to try to build a home on the new parcels. I have tried to sell my property, but cannot, **because a county employee won't allow me the access the county earlier approved** - he claims that the county's ordinances prevent access to the nearest road. According to the county, I must now construct a bridge by importing several thousand yards of fill dirt into a stream, across my neighbor's property, in order to gain access to my property, at an added expense of several thousands of dollars.

For those of you who are recent homeowners or property owners who don't think Ballot Measure 37 will protect your rights, consider my situation. My access was approved by the county in the year 2000, and then **less than four years later** those rights have been taken from me. If Ballot Measure 37 was the law in Oregon right now, my rights would not have been taken from me.

Please join me in supporting Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Ruth Grimsrud.)

Argument in Favor

The Molalla Christian Church

The Molalla Christian Church is a growing church in Molalla whose membership is primarily made up of rural residents of southern Clackamas County. Our present facility has many constraints that limit our ability to grow and accomplish our religious mission, i.e. limited parking, location in a residential neighborhood with no room to expand, and very small rooms for children's classes.

More than ten years ago, the leadership of the church decided that we should locate and purchase a new property that would allow us to build a multipurpose facility that would better accommodate the congregation, and would also allow for enough space for other activities for our youth and the community. In 1997, we purchased a ten acre parcel located outside the Molalla Urban Growth Boundary.

We hired an attorney and started the long, drawn-out process with Clackamas County. The planning department and the County hearings officer denied our application because Oregon's land use system makes protecting farmland more important than religion. We appealed to the Clackamas County Commission, who approved our application based on Federal law.

In what seems to be the standard operating procedure in Oregon, a fringe group that believes "farmland" is the Holy Grail, appealed the County's decision to LUBA. Unfortunately, their appeal was granted.

After two years of litigating this issue we are back at square one. What is really difficult for us to understand is that if we built an identical structure and called it a community center there would be no problem. However, once we started talking about God in the building, we could be prosecuted.

It is unbelievable that in the land of liberty, private property owners, no matter whether you are a farmer, rural resident, or a church, we do not have the right to use our property in a manner to meet our own needs. Ballot Measure 37 will restore those rights.

Please join us in supporting Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Martin Kirk.)

Argument in Favor

Endorsing Measure # 37

The Oregon State Grange (OSG) endorses Measure # 37. The OSG has specific policy statements that address the need for government to compensate for loss of use or value of private property. To begin with, OSG policy Le08.90 states; "We are opposed to LCDC's Goal 5, or any similar act, which virtually halts all economic use of property by setting it aside for wildlife habitat, scenic views, wetlands and other public uses without compensation to the owner. Furthermore, if state land use planning arbitrarily changes the use and value of any land, appropriate compensation for the loss of value should be given." Furthermore, policy Le02.95 states, in part; "We will work with State Legislators, the LCDC, and all other pertinent agencies to require that any public institution that condemns property for public use must pay the difference in fair market value..." The OSG's membership is made up of mostly families from smaller communities and rural areas who, know the importance of protecting private property and OSG policy Le05.95 states; "We are against the abrogation of Private property rights and will use any means necessary to return and defend private property rights."

Oregon State Grange
643 Union Street NE
Salem, OR 97301-2462

(This information furnished by John Fine, Oregon State Grange.)

Argument in Favor

We are the chief petitioners of Ballot Measure 37. This statement is provided in order to instruct and aid the Oregon courts in determining the legislative intent behind Ballot Measure 37, and avoid a situation where the Oregon Courts misinterpret the intent of this law, as Oregon courts are known to do.

Several special interest groups are trying to confuse the voters about Ballot Measure 37. These groups are trying to make Ballot Measure 37 seem much more complicated than it really is.

For instance, opponents of Ballot Measure 37 are distorting the compensation protections of Ballot Measure 37. Through the normal condemnation process, the state government and local governments have an efficient statutory procedure already used to determine just compensation. The process is quick, clean, and extremely efficient and will be the basis for determining just compensation under Ballot Measure 37.

Next, opponents of Ballot Measure 37 try to confuse the issue of just compensation by claiming it will be impossible to determine what regulations will trigger a property owner's rights under Ballot Measure 37. Again, any land use regulation (as that term is currently defined in Oregon law) enacted after a property owner acquired the property that has the effect of reducing the fair market value of your home will trigger Ballot Measure 37's protections. If, for instance, there are three regulations which reduce a property's value, a property owner can demand use or compensation based upon the effect of any of the three regulations, or based upon the effect of all three regulation, or any combination thereof. What's more, subject to the statute of limitations in section (5), if a property owner submits demand for use or compensation based upon one regulation, the same property owner is not precluded from later demanding use or compensation based upon regulations that existed at the time the property owner submitted her first demand.

Please join us in voting Yes on Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Dorothy English, Barbara Prete, Eugene Prete.)

Argument in Favor

Ollie Wilcox

My name is Ollie Wilcox. I am 75 years old and I own 8.32 acres in Colton, Oregon. I've owned this property since 1965 have always paid by taxes with the idea that in my senior years this property would provide me with a comfortable retirement, which would keep me from being dependent upon the government for support.

All of the other parcels surrounding my property are 2 to 5 acres parcels. My property has the typical urban services such as electricity, city water, access to the road, or fire protection. Further, subdividing my property is supported in my community: 39 of the citizens who live within a quarter-mile of my property signed a petition supporting my application to divide my property. There simply is no compelling reason why my property should not be divided.

My property was intended to be my retirement. And Clackamas County took it from me. When Clackamas County steals your life savings, they hide behind Oregon land use laws. The fact is that Oregon's land use laws are stealing the life savings from Oregon's seniors.

All I want to do is to enjoy the rights I had when I purchased my property nearly 40 years ago. I don't believe that I am asking for too much, nor do I believe that it is unreasonable for Oregonians to expect their property rights to be respected.

Ballot Measure 37 will restore the rights of Oregonians, rights that were taken away by an unfair, unbalanced system. I have been fighting Clackamas County for many years, and I plan to continuing the fight. Ballot Measure 37 will help families avoid losing retirement the way I lost

mine. Please join me in voting yes on Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Ollie Wilcox.)

Argument in Favor

Dean Grudzinski

I purchased a relatively small parcel in the southwest hills of Portland in 1986. At the time I purchased the property, I could have divided it into three parcels. As far as I knew, the area where my property is located - at the time I purchased the property - planned to be developed as any ordinary Portland neighborhood.

Over the next few years the city of Portland continuously "upzoned" the property across the street from me, allowing significantly higher development densities than originally planned, but beneficial to me nonetheless. After development was completed in my neighborhood, three of the four parcels surrounding my property had been developed - I went from having four neighbors to thirteen neighbors in this period of time.

Then, the city of Portland got involved.

My property was downzoned in 2001, and the city of Portland placed an environmental overlay zone on my property. "Environmental overlay zone" is government-speak for "a home for a fish is more important than a home for your family". In fact, I received a letter from the city of Portland to that effect.

The other reason my property was downzoned? All of my new "neighbors" liked my property in its natural state and they didn't want to see it developed. These people wanted to keep my property natural so they could enjoy nature and protect their "visual sensibilities", their "livability", and their "community aesthetics".

However, my neighbors don't want to pay for these benefits. They want me to pay for it. And I am.

Everything has been taken from me. Three years later I still have not recovered my rights, and the city of Portland has no intention of restoring them. The only protection homeowners and property owners in Oregon have from having everything taken from them is Ballot Measure 37, which will protect the rights you had at the time you purchased your property.

Please join me in voting Yes on Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Dean Grudzinski.)

Argument in Favor

As chief petitioners of Ballot Measure 37, it is necessary to correct the false statements made by groups who oppose common sense reform to Oregon land use system. In addition, this statement is provided in order to instruct and aid the Oregon courts, so to avoid the courts from misinterpreting our intent behind this measure, as the Oregon courts have a habit of doing.

Despite claims to the contrary, Ballot Measure 37 does not prohibit the state of Oregon and/or local governments from adopting laws that regulate public health and safety. In fact, Ballot Measure 37 specifically excludes statutes and regulations like fire codes, building codes, health codes, sanitation codes, solid wastes or hazardous waste regulations and/or codes, pollution control regulations, traffic safety regulations, from being subject to Ballot Measure 37's protections.

It is not our intention that Ballot Measure 37 be interpreted in such a way as to allow statutes, regulations, goals, ordinances or whatever other means of regulation currently defined in statute, regulation, case law etc. as a land use regulation to be bootstrapped into the definition of building codes, public health and safety codes, sanitation codes, or public welfare codes, by the courts.

In other words, there currently exists a body of law in Oregon which defines what constitutes regulation of land use. It is those regulations that are subject to the provisions of Ballot Measure 37. The state government and/or local government should not be allowed to rename a land use regulation simply to avoid the protections of Ballot Measure 37.

In sum, it is likely that opponents of Ballot Measure 37 will continue to distort the intent and effect of the measure long after the measure is voted on. Hopefully we the chief petitioners have provided a clarity as to the intent of Section (3)(B) of Ballot Measure 37.

Thank you for taking the time to read our comments. Please join us in supporting Ballot Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Dorothy English, Barbara Prete, Eugene Prete.)

Argument in Favor

TRUCK DRIVERS SUPPORT MEASURE 37

The Oregon Forest Products Transportation Association urges a yes vote on Measure 37.

Oregon has a long history of family owned timber operations. For decades, timber and agriculture formed the backbone of Oregon's economy. Rural communities and small towns were built around timber harvesting and the jobs it provided.

This proud tradition is alive today. Our members live and work in rural areas and small towns across the state. We work hard for a living, and are proud to be good stewards of the land that we own and which contributes directly to our livelihood.

Because we make our living from the land, we have a deep respect for the right of Americans to own and use their property. We know that without this right, all of our other rights are seriously weakened, and our freedoms are in jeopardy.

We support Measure 37 because it protects private citizens and their property. When regulations change after property is purchased, we suffer, and so do the families and businesses that depend on us.

Without Measure 37, we are at the mercy of extremists who file lawsuits to challenge every job we work and lobby state officials to change the rules to make it impossible for us to stay in business. When this happens, no one wins (except the lawyers).

Measure 37 will make sure that property owners are treated fairly, and that no one is forced to give his land to the state for free. That's not the way things are done in this country.

Please vote yes on Measure 37.

(This information furnished by D.E. Bridges, Oregon Forest Products Transportation Association.)

Argument in Favor

If you are like most people, your home and property are the most valuable thing you own.

That's why most people are very careful when they buy property. You check to make sure that you can use your land before paying for it. After all, you want to be sure that the property can be used for a home, business, or farm or whatever else you had in mind.

But what happens when the government changes the rules after you purchase your land, and you can no longer use your property as you had planned? In most cases, you lose.

Why? Because a court cannot award you money for the loss of the use of your land until you have submitted enough applications to the government to prove that your land has no value. In some cases, as many as 25 separate applications must be filed.

Each of these applications costs money - in many cases, the cost to submit the applications is more than the value of the property!

In other words, you have to pay multiple application fees to the same government that changed the rules and took away all value of your property, just to get your day in court, and even if you win in court, you don't get your application fees back. What a rip off.

Measure 37 will end this ridiculous game. Rather than making a landowner submit application after application to the government, knowing full well that each application will be denied, Measure 37 sets up a simple process for making your claim for compensation.

If the government takes your land, they should pay you for it, and they shouldn't tie you up in red tape and outrageous fees just so you can have your day in court.

Please vote yes on Measure 37.

(This information furnished by David J. Hunnicutt, Family Farm Preservation PAC.)

Argument in Favor

Protect Oregon's Family Farm Base and Schools

Rural Schools and Communities Depend on Property Values

Not only do farms and ranches depend on property values, local rural communities depend on the tax base to run local governments and local schools. When government takes private property values, everyone loses.

If it is Free, Then There is Unlimited Demand

Unfortunately, even though the Constitution requires compensation when government takes your land, some governments refuse to pay for what they take. They know that almost no landowner will have the money or stamina to fight a lengthy court battle just to recover the lost value of their land. Because there is little chance that their actions will be challenged, there are no consequences to taking land without paying for it.

We Need a Balance Between the Economy and Preservation

There are some Oregonians who want to stop all land uses on rural lands, and make Oregon one giant public park. We all cherish Oregon's public parks and beaches. But we also need to make sure that farmers, ranchers, and foresters have land to farm and harvest timber. These industries create jobs and tax revenue for struggling Oregon towns and cities.

By allowing government to preserve areas it wants to protect, and allowing other lands to be used, we strengthen our economy, and provide help for so many Oregonians in depressed areas.

Vote Yes on Measure 37

Measure 37 clears away government hurdles to compensation, and strikes a balance between the economy and preservation. A yes vote on Measure 37 will provide much needed relief for farmers and ranchers, and will strengthen the tax base in all Oregon communities.

(This information furnished by Larry George, Oregon Family Farm Association.)

Argument in Favor

MEASURE 37 BENEFITS TAXPAYERS

The Taxpayer Association of Oregon (TAO) urges a Yes vote on Measure 37.

Oregon taxpayers would be wise to support Measure 37. In November, 2000, the State of Oregon estimated that the state and local government property regulations took over \$5 billion per year in property value from Oregon property owners.

It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out what happens to property taxes when government regulations lower the value of property - the tax revenues go down. Imagine what would happen if the government restored just a fraction of what it took each year.

When state or local governments pass new regulations that lower property values, everyone loses. The property owner loses because his property's value has been destroyed. Cities and counties lose because their tax base goes down. And remaining taxpayers lose because they are asked to pay more taxes to make up the loss resulting from the adoption of the new regulations.

On the other hand, when state or local governments give property owners freedom to use their property, everyone wins. The property owner realizes his investment. Cities and counties have a new source of revenue. Jobs are created for Oregon residents. And remaining taxpayers aren't asked to support higher and higher tax increases.

It doesn't matter whether you are a renter or a homeowner. When the property tax base shrinks because more property is taken off the tax rolls by property restrictions that destroy its value, **we all pay more.** What a rip off.

We believe in Oregon property owners, and we trust that they will make wise use of their property, if they are just given the opportunity. That's why we support Measure 37.

For more information on protecting your property rights, go to www.oregonwatchdog.com.

Please vote yes on Measure 37.

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

Argument in Favor

Private property is one of the most basic freedoms spoken of in the Bible. The 8th Commandment prohibits theft. The case laws in Exodus 21-23 require restitution to owners of property stolen or damaged by others. Deuteronomy 27:17 requires God's people to affirm private property rights or be cursed ("Cursed be he that removes his neighbor's landmark. And all the people shall say, Amen."). Clearly, private property is to be protected by the government.

This stress found its way into the formation of our country. Thomas Jefferson's inalienable rights of "life, liberty and the **pursuit of happiness**" were a recasting of John Locke's "life, liberty and **property**." Our happiness is tied to the right use of our property. So, our founding fathers placed a high wall of protection around these rights. The Bill of Rights includes the "right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures."

English common law, the basis for our national Constitution, allowed governments to take private property when needed for public purposes. This is called "eminent domain." But **it insisted that the owner be paid for the land taken.** Sometimes the government's actions don't result in a total taking of someone's property. The government may rezone your land, restrict your right to use the trees on it, etc. In these cases, this Measure would ensure that you be paid for the loss of value that you have suffered at the hands of the government.

Good men may disagree whether eminent domain is appropriate in a Christian society. But all should agree that the State should recompense the owner for property taken. **And the State should recompense the owner for whatever reduction in value the State's actions create.** We thus recommend a Yes vote on Measure 37.

Dennis Tuuri for the Parents Education Association
Box 847, Canby, OR 97013 503-263-8337 peapac.org

(This information furnished by Dennis Tuuri, Executive Director, Parents Education Association.)

Argument in Favor

\$\$\$ MAKE MONEY FAST WITH MEASURE 37! \$\$\$

WE ARE LOOKING FOR PROPERTY OWNERS WHO WANT TO CAPITALIZE ON MEASURE 37! WHEN PASSED, THIS MEASURE WILL ELIMINATE ALL ZONING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION IN PROPERTIES ACROSS OREGON.

We need:

1. Homes in high-income neighborhoods where we can open new RESTAURANTS, STRIP MALLS, and NIGHTCLUBS.
2. Homes in rural neighborhoods to locate ADULT ENTERTAINMENT BUSINESSES such as swingers' clubs, lingerie shows, and male-only bathhouses.

3. Homes in any area for textile-processing FACTORIES and medium-security DETENTION FACILITIES.
4. Farmland in any area for rapid development of WASTE PROCESSING and maximum-security private PENITENTIARY SYSTEMS.
5. Timberland in any area for LOGGING, OPEN-PIT LEACH MINING, and SUB-DIVISION.

I am a land speculator originally from Southern California. My team and I can match your property with aforementioned businesses for FAST PROFIT. As Measure 37 can eliminate ALL zoning, we are interested in any property, regardless of current zoning, proximity to schools, or environmental safeguards.

Oregon residential areas offer prime targets for development of exciting "in-neighborhood" businesses, including retail, adult, small-scale industrial, and gaming & gambling. Measure 37 may open up all residential areas to such profitable ventures.

PLEASE CONTACT US ASAP AS THIS IS A LIMITED TIME OFFER. IT IS NECESSARY TO ACT BEFORE THE MONEY RUNS OUT - TAXPAYERS MUST FOOT THE BILL TO PAY OFF CLAIMANTS TO ABIDE TO LOCAL ZONING. THIS WILL COST 100s OF MILLIONS ANNUALLY (AND THIS IS WHERE WE WILL GET OUR MONEY!)

MEASURE 37: GET YOURS WHILE THE GETTING'S GOOD!

<http://www.GetRichQuickWithMeasure37.com>

<http://www.GetRichQuickWithMeasure37.com>

<http://www.GetRichQuickWithMeasure37.com>

(This information furnished by Peter Bray.)

Argument in Favor

\$\$\$ MAKE MONEY FAST WITH MEASURE 37! \$\$\$

WE ARE LOOKING FOR PROPERTY OWNERS WHO WANT TO CAPITALIZE ON MEASURE 37! WHEN PASSED, THIS MEASURE WILL ELIMINATE ALL ZONING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION IN PROPERTIES ACROSS OREGON.

We need:

1. Homes in high-income neighborhoods where we can open new RESTAURANTS, STRIP MALLS, and NIGHTCLUBS.

2. Homes in rural neighborhoods to locate ADULT ENTERTAINMENT BUSINESSES such as swingers' clubs, lingerie shows, and male-only bathhouses.
3. Homes in any area for textile-processing FACTORIES and medium-security DETENTION FACILITIES.
4. Farmland in any area for rapid development of WASTE PROCESSING and maximum-security private PENITENTIARY SYSTEMS.
5. Timberland in any area for LOGGING, OPEN-PIT LEACH MINING, and SUB-DIVISION.

I am a land speculator originally from Southern California. My team and I can match your property with aforementioned businesses for FAST PROFIT. As Measure 37 can eliminate ALL zoning, we are interested in any property, regardless of current zoning, proximity to schools, or environmental safeguards.

Oregon residential areas offer prime targets for development of exciting "in-neighborhood" businesses, including retail, adult, small-scale industrial, and gaming & gambling. Measure 37 may open up all residential areas to such profitable ventures.

PLEASE CONTACT US ASAP AS THIS IS A LIMITED TIME OFFER. IT IS NECESSARY TO ACT BEFORE THE MONEY RUNS OUT - TAXPAYERS MUST FOOT THE BILL TO PAY OFF CLAIMANTS TO ABIDE TO LOCAL ZONING. THIS WILL COST 100s OF MILLIONS ANNUALLY (AND THIS IS WHERE WE WILL GET OUR MONEY!)

MEASURE 37: GET YOURS WHILE THE GETTING'S GOOD!

<http://www.GetRichQuickWithMeasure37.com>

<http://www.GetRichQuickWithMeasure37.com>

<http://www.GetRichQuickWithMeasure37.com>

(This information furnished by Peter Bray.)