

Measure 37 Argument in Opposition

Ballot Measure 37 is complex. Do not be deceived by the concept of compensation. Everyone wants government to compensate for its actions in some manner. But there are some key points in this proposal that cause us to ask for your NO vote.

It reaches back at least three generations and requires the current owner to determine what, if any, land use restrictions were in place when grandpa and grandma acquired the property. Is it even possible to go back to the early 1900's and know what land use restrictions existed? Many counties and cities do not have records that far back. It is wrong to try to go back to past generations. Yet this measure clearly defines family members of current owners and allows the current owner to go back to what was in place when their grandparents acquired the land and it has stayed in the family.

It requires the Oregon government entity to pay for loss of land value because of the restrictions they place on the land, unless they simply remove the restrictions. There is no funding provided, or mechanism for finding funding. With no money to pay the compensation, the only recourse the government entity has is to remove the restriction. So an owner can put a development on the land that is clearly not compatible with surrounding land uses, creating a hodgepodge of land use that Oregonians have tried to avoid with the concept of land use planning.

Remember also that many land use restrictions come from Federal regulations and are not affected by this measure.

The primary loss to Oregon would be farmland, forestland and open space. Currently limited in use, that protection disappears as counties are unable to compensate when the current owner wants to subdivide into small parcels and put buildings on the parcels that could have been done a hundred years ago.

(This information furnished by Fritz Ellett, Hood River County Farm Bureau, Wasco County Farm Bureau.)

Argument in Opposition

County Farm Bureaus Oppose Measure 37

We represent hundreds of family farmers throughout Oregon who are opposed to Measure 37.

Why?

Because Measure 37 is so poorly written it will put many farmers out of business by increasing taxes and rolling back the safeguards that protect Oregon's farmland from overdevelopment.

As farmers, we are property owners who work on the land every day. We deal with government. and all its processes and procedures, every day.

We can't afford the additional layers of paperwork, bureaucracy, lawsuits and costs associated with Measure 37.

Measure 37 is going to make it harder for farmers to farm and more difficult for Oregonians to protect farmland from over-development.

Please join us in voting No on Measure 37.

**Benton County Farm Bureau
Clackamas County Farm Bureau
Grant County Farm Bureau
Hood River County Farm Bureau
Jefferson County Farm Bureau
Lane County Farm Bureau
Linn County Farm Bureau
Marion County Farm Bureau
Polk County Farm Bureau
Tillamook County Farm Bureau
Wasco County Farm Bureau
Washington County Farm Bureau
Yamhill County Farm Bureau**

(This information furnished by Larry Wells, Marion County Farm Bureau.)

Argument in Opposition

Protect Private Property Rights Vote NO on Measure 37

Homeowners from across Oregon oppose Measure 37

The single most important investment many of us ever make is buying a home. For us, our home and property are the most valuable things we own.

But what will happen to your home or your property when government can change the regulations and rules as they go along?

Measure 37 is so poorly written that it allows government to decide one thing for your neighbor's property and something totally different for yours.

And that's just wrong. Treating homeowners and property owners fairly is the foundation of our country.

What's more, Measure 37 will eliminate any notice requirement to neighbors if government decides to allow some property owners to tear down, rebuild, or develop their property. That's not fair either.

What's worse? While Measure 37 creates inequities for home and property owners, and removes notice provisions, it adds more layers of government administration and red tape.

The Secretary of State, Director of Revenue, Treasurer and Director of Administrative Services issued a Financial Impact Statement that concluded Measure 37 will cost as much as \$344 million annually, just for administration. That's before a single property owner sees a dime.

And who's going to pay for it when the measure itself provides no new revenue?

We are. Homeowners, property owners and taxpayers. That's just not fair.

(This information furnished by Morgan Allen, No on 37 - Take A Closer Look Committee.)

Argument in Opposition

Small and Locally Owned Businesses Urge you to Vote "NO" on Measure 37

All across Oregon, small and locally owned businesses are struggling to recover from our recent economic downturn. And Oregon's economy still faces many challenges. The last thing we need is more uncertainty, more costs, and more hurdles that make it harder for our companies to do business.

If Measure 37 passes it will have serious consequences for every Oregon business.

- **Measure 37 will create new layers of red tape at every level of government**

This measure is so complex and vague that it will require a new layer of government regulation and even more steps to get approval of basic things like building permits. More bureaucracy makes it tougher to do business in Oregon.

- **Measure 37 will cost taxpayers and businesses up to \$344 million dollars a year just to pay for the new paperwork, procedures and processes that this measure mandates**

And no one knows what the final price tag will be. The state's own financial impact statement concludes that the final cost to businesses and taxpayers cannot be determined.

- **Measure 37 provides no new revenues to pay for all this administration and bureaucracy**

Measure 37 will cost Oregon taxpayers and businesses too much by creating too many processes and procedures. More costs, more red tape, and more bureaucracy will discourage businesses from locating in Oregon.

**Support your locally owned businesses and
vote "NO" on Measure 37**

BOORA Architects
Portland

Carter MacNichol
Sheils Oblatz Johnsen
Portland

Tillamook County Creamery Association

Mike Hollern
Brooks Resources
Bend

Mike Roach and Kim Osgood,
Co-Owners
Paloma Clothing
Portland

Kurt Schrader
Clackamas County Veterinary Clinic
Oregon City

Colleen French
Ozone Café
Portland

Lynn Lundquist
BarLynn Ranch
Powell Butte

Shannon Rose
Realtor
Washington County

Susan Sokol Blosser
Sokol Blosser Winery
Dundee

Sean Cruz
Real Estate Broker
Portland

Stan Amy
New Villages Group
Portland

Lonn Hoklin
Suasion
Tigard

Betsy Imholt
Time and Space Consulting
Aurora

(This information furnished by Mike Roach, Co-Owner, Paloma Clothing.)

Argument in Opposition

Governor Ted Kulongoski (Democrat)

& Former Governor Victor Atiyeh (Republican) both agree:

"Measure 37 is **Wrong** for Oregon."

For over forty years we've watched Oregon grow and change. We've seen ballot measures that make Oregon a better place, and ballot measures that hurt Oregon.

Measure 37 will hurt Oregon.

Measure 37 has a simple but misleading ballot title. It implies it will protect property rights, but in reality it offers no guarantees for property owners. It provides only one guarantee - new administrative procedures and more paperwork for property owners. The last thing Oregonians need is more

useless, time-consuming and costly government rules and regulations. As Governors during some of Oregon's toughest economic times, we know first hand the costs of red tape and unnecessary paperwork.

Measure 37 is so full of fine print, and so poorly written, that the Secretary of State's financial impact statement says it could cost up to \$344 million a year for new local and state government paperwork and administration - and that's before a single property owner sees a dime.

Where will the money come from?

The measure summary itself "provides no new revenue."

We know from experience that to create more jobs and protect our quality of life, we need a government that works. Oregon's Attorney General has already warned that this initiative is full of "uncertainty," with several areas of "significant dispute." (Department of Justice memorandum, July 19, 2004.)

As Governors, we are very concerned that Measure 37 will paralyze permit processes, tie up our legal system and cost you money.

Please join us in voting NO on Measure 37.

Governor Ted Kulongoski
Democrat

Former Governor Victor Atiyeh
Republican

(This information furnished by Governor Ted Kulongoski.)

Argument in Opposition

ESTIMATED COST TO TAXPAYERS

Measure 37 will cost taxpayers up to \$344 million per year to administer.

"The measure would require state administrative expenditures to respond to claims for compensation of between **\$18 million and \$44 million per year.**

The measure may require compensation to landowners. The amount of state expenditures needed to pay claims for compensation cannot be determined...

The measure would require local government administrative expenditures to respond to claims for compensation of between \$46 million and \$300 million per year.

The measure may require compensation to landowners. The amount of local government expenditures needed to pay claims for compensation cannot be determined..."

Estimate of Financial Impact, July 22, 2004

As Oregon's state auditor and chief financial officer, we serve on the Financial Impact Committee that researched the costs of Measure 37. Please consider the costs to taxpayers when voting on Measure 37.

Bill Bradbury
Oregon Secretary of State
Fiscal Impact Committee member

Randall Edwards
Oregon State Treasurer
Fiscal Impact Committee member

(This information furnished by Bill Bradbury, Oregon Secretary of State.)

Argument in Opposition

Former Oregon Judges Urge Voters To Take A Closer Cook At Measure 37

As former judges we know first hand how a poorly written and complicated measure can lead to lawsuits, uncertainty and increased costs.

Measure 37 is just too complex and vague. Under this measure the government gets to choose who gets paid and who does not. The measure doesn't say how government will make those decisions, who in government will make them, or that government must make the same decision for all property owners.

If this measure becomes law, government could decide one thing for your neighbor's property and something totally different for yours.

Measure 37 will cause endless lawsuits, paralyze local government permit processes, and tie up our court system. All of which will increase costs to taxpayers.

We urge your "No" vote on Measure 37.

Betty Roberts
Justice
Oregon Supreme Court
1982-1986

Jacob Tanzer
Justice
Oregon Supreme Court
1980-1983

William L. Richardson
Chief Judge & Judge
Oregon Court of Appeals
1978-1997

(This information furnished by Jacob Tanzer.)

Argument in Opposition

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF OREGON OPPOSES MEASURE 37

MEASURE 37 IS NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

This measure forces state and local governments to make a choice they shouldn't have to make. Either pay landowners to comply with current regulations and processes that protect our neighborhoods, farmland, wildlife, and open space, OR allow landowners to violate those regulations. TAXPAYERS LOSE EITHER WAY.

MEASURE 37 WILL LEAD TO NON-ENFORCEMENT OF LAND-USE LAWS

Oregon's land-use system has been regarded as a model across the country for over thirty years. We only have to look at the uncontrolled development in other states to appreciate what this legacy has meant to our quality of life. As Oregonians we care deeply about managing growth, planning for development, preserving rural lands, and protecting our scenic vistas. Because Measure 37 will undoubtedly lead to non-enforcement of our land-use laws, it seeks to undo all that we have accomplished, and we become one of those "other" states. LAND USE REGULATION PRESERVES OREGON FOR ALL OREGONIANS.

WE CAN'T AFFORD IT

To deal with possible claims, Measure 37 will require new processes, procedures and paperwork for every governmental entity in the state. The Financial Impact Statement estimates that Measure 37 will result in direct administrative costs of up to \$344 million per year even before paying a single claim. With budgets so tight, do we really want to make additional cuts in schools and services to add more bureaucracy to our government?

**The League of Women Voters of Oregon
urges you to VOTE NO on Measure 37.
PROTECT OUR POCKETBOOKS AND
OREGON'S LIVEABILITY.**

(This information furnished by Margaret Noel, President, League of Women Voters of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Farmers & Nursery Owners
Oppose Measure 37

We are property owners from all over Oregon who depend on the land for our livelihood. Our land is our single greatest investment - our families, workers, and Oregon's economy rely on us.

Measure 37 threatens our property.

How?

Measure 37 is so poorly written it will allow government to decide one thing for your neighbor's property and something totally different for yours. That means one thing - lawsuits. As farmers and nursery owners we cannot afford stalled permit processes, uncertainty and years of litigation. We believe Measure 37 will put some farmers and nursery owners out of business.

More troubling is the fact that no one knows the total cost of Measure 37. The financial impact statement estimates it could cost up to \$344 million a year just for new local and state government paperwork and administration. And, that's before a single lawsuit.

But one thing is clear, **Measure 37 provides no new revenue.**

In today's world farmers and nursery owners need predictability and certainty. Measure 37 is costly, confusing, and full of uncertainty.

We urge you to vote **NO** on Measure 37.

Oregon Agricultural Alliance

(This information furnished by Scott Ashcom, Oregon Agricultural Alliance.)

Argument in Opposition

OREGON SENIORS ARE VOTING NO ON 37

Too Much New Government, Too Many New Costs

One of the ways you can tell good ideas from bad ideas or, in this case, good public policy from bad public policy, is to look first at the facts, and then at who comes to the table in support or opposition to a measure.

The facts in this case are pretty clear. The state fiscal impact analysis says Measure 37 will cost up to \$344 million a year just in layers of new government, and nobody can tell how much it will cost in the end.

Money's already too tight and services are already stretched too thin. The last thing we need is more costs to taxpayers and more layers of government standing between people and the services they need, and deserve, from our government.

Measure 37 is a bad idea.

It costs too much, creates too many layers of new government and will lead to too many lawsuits.

**We ask Oregonians to join thousands of seniors in
Voting NO on 37.**

**Gray Panthers
Oregon Alliance for Retired Americans
Oregon Association for Retired Citizens**

(This information furnished by James Davis, Oregon Association for Retired Citizens, Gray Panthers.)

Argument in Opposition

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS OPPOSE MEASURE 37

It's costly, complex and unfair

We are a coalition of 20 neighborhood associations.

We oppose Measure 37 because it will cost taxpayers \$344 million in administrative costs alone. We oppose creating more government processes, procedures and paperwork. We oppose putting the interests of a few large landowners over the values of fairness and citizen involvement. We oppose making taxpayers pay others to obey the laws we all live by.

Measure 37 does nothing to protect neighbors from the harmful effects of development. In fact, if Measure 37 passes government will no longer be required to provide notice to neighbors before certain property owners build something that doesn't comply with current land use and zoning requirements.

Measure 37 will undermine our right to participate in local decisions that affect our neighborhoods. We have worked hard for over 35 years to ensure that citizens have a voice in decisions about development. Citizen participation is meaningless if governments can arbitrarily choose to waive quality-of-life protections. **Measure 37 is so poorly written that it would be bottled up in the courts for years while our property values hang in the balance. With money so tight, we can't afford it.**

Join us in saying NO to this unworkable measure and say yes to citizen involvement, accountable government, and protections for our quality of life.

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON 37!

Southeast UPLIFT Neighborhood Program
Linda Nettekoven, Co-Chair

Southeast UPLIFT Neighborhood Program,
Scott Vala, Co-Chair

Brentwood-Darlington Neighborhood Association

Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Aaron Ernst, Chair

Buckman Community Association
Susan Lindsay, Chair

Center Neighborhood Association

Mt. Scott-Arleta Neighborhood Association
Jim Williams, Chair

Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Program
Land Use and Transportation Committee
Paul Loney, Chair

Brooklyn Action Corps
Emily McKinnon, Chair

Creston-Kenilworth Neighborhood Association,
Benjamin Hazelton, Chair

(This information furnished by Linda Nettekoven, Southeast UPLIFT Neighborhood Program.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Recreation & Park Association Opposes Measure 37

The Oregon Recreation & Park Association (ORPA) strongly opposes Measure 37. ORPA is an organization with over 650 professional members, citizens and community advocates that provide park and recreation services throughout Oregon.

ORPA opposes Measure 37 for the following reasons:

1. Measure 37 is poorly written and consequently **taxpayers will have to pay costly legal fees** to clarify its meaning through the courts.
2. The state's own fiscal impact statement says **Measure 37 will cost taxpayers up to \$344 million annually**, just to process the new bureaucracy and paperwork required by Measure 37.
3. In addition, based on how Measure 37 is written, **no one knows what the cost will be to taxpayers** to fully implement it.
4. Measure 37 provides **no new revenue** to pay for the costs to taxpayers, thereby, increasing the tax burden on Oregon citizens.
5. Measure 37 severely **limits the ability of local communities to acquire land for public park development** by artificially driving up the price of land and draining local budgets.

Measure 37 will harm public parks and recreation services throughout the state. The severe budget impact caused by Measure 37 would seriously limit local citizens' ability to make decisions about their own community. It will take the important decisions about community park and recreation services from citizens and give the decision-making power to costly attorneys.

**Protect Oregon's Public Parks
Vote NO on Measure 37**

Oregon Recreation & Park Association

(This information furnished by Frank Jagodnik, Executive Director, Oregon Recreation and Park Association.)

Argument in Opposition

Local Community Leaders Oppose Measure 37

As Mayors, we're responsible for the day-to-day details of making government work for you. We work to keep your communities healthy and safe, with family wage jobs, good schools and affordable housing.

Measure 37 will make it tougher to do our job.

Why? It's pretty simple. According to the financial impact statement done by the State of Oregon, Measure 37 will cost up to **\$344 million annually** in paperwork and administrative expenses for governments around the state. And there may be other costs that cannot be determined. So no one knows the total cost of this measure.

Where will the money come from? Measure 37 "provides no new revenue source for payments." With budgets so tight already, we can't afford Measure 37.

Please join us in voting No on Measure 37.

Alan W. DeBoer, Mayor of Ashland
Rob Drake, Mayor, City of Beaverton
Helen Berg, Mayor of Corvallis
Jim Fairchild, Mayor of Dallas
Richard Kidd, Mayor of Forest Grove
Charles Becker, Mayor of Gresham
Eugene Grant, Mayor Happy Valley
Tom Hughes, Mayor of Hillsboro
Jim Lewis, Mayor, City of Jacksonville
Todd Kellstrom, Mayor of Klamath Falls
Judie Hammerstad, Mayor, City of Lake Oswego
Lindsey Berryman, Mayor of Medford
Lori Hollingsworth, Mayor of Lincoln City

Alice Norris, Mayor of Oregon City
Vera Katz, Mayor of Portland
Linda Malone, Mayor of Sandy
Ken Hector, Mayor of Silverton
David Dodds, Mayor of West Linn
Charlotte Lehan, Mayor of Wilsonville

(This information furnished by Rob Drake.)

Argument in Opposition

As a lifelong Oregonian, I urge you to take a closer look at Measure 37, its unanswered questions, costs and bureaucracy.

Since Governor Tom McCall appointed me to the Livable Oregon Commission, I have spent my career working with Oregonians to protect the quality of life in their neighborhoods as well as national treasures like the Columbia River Gorge and Mt. Hood. In Congress, I've been privileged to help the federal government learn from the Oregon experience how to be a better partner with local communities, working with them to manage special places and balance growth with private property rights and environmental protections that benefit us all.

I am proud of the Oregon land use planning program. Since its inception in 1973, rural and urban Oregonians have worked closely together to make it better, responding to changing circumstances and new opportunities. Now, more than thirty years later, our pioneering land use system remains one of the best in the United States, attracting world wide attention and praise.

Is it perfect? Are we finished? Absolutely not, because Oregon is dynamic and growing. But as we work to make our land use planning program better, we need to do it the Oregon way--together. What we can't afford is an expensive, complex, and bureaucratic fix that creates more problems than it solves.

I urge you to join me in rejecting this poorly-thought-out and untried proposal. One of the lessons we've learned over the past thirty years is that we need to make changes carefully, know what we are doing, and understand what the outcomes will be. Our homes, our businesses and our special places are simply too precious to put at risk. Working together, we can continue to make craft a land use program that meets the needs of all Oregonians.

Thank you for taking a careful look. I hope you will join me in voting No on 37.

Earl Blumenauer

(This information furnished by Congressman Earl Blumenauer.)

Argument in Opposition

Dear Oregon Taxpayer,

My name is Pete Sorenson, an elected Lane County Commissioner. I grew up in Coos County, graduated from the University of Oregon, ran a private law firm, and served as an elected Oregon State Senator. **As a County Commissioner, I am deeply involved in the administration of Oregon's land use laws. These laws, some of the most progressive in the United States, are crucial to maintaining our environment and high quality of life. It is from my experience working with these laws as a former practicing attorney and as a former State Senator, that I oppose this ballot measure.**

Passing this measure will cost Oregon taxpayers money and hurt farmers. To comply with the measure it will cost Oregon taxpayers up to \$344 million annually. These costs will result from increased government employees to research and process claims and from increased costs of litigation.

This measure provides no new sources of revenue to pay for the land. Because this ballot measure does not provide revenue, cities and counties will be forced to make cuts in places like law enforcement, drug rehabilitation, and education. With the recent cutbacks to local and state budgets, we cannot afford these cuts.

This measure means more litigation and lawsuits. The Attorney General's office has warned of "uncertainties" and ambiguities in the bill. These "uncertainties" mean more lawsuits that will cost the public money and time that could be spent in other more productive ways.

Passing measure 37 means more taxes, more red tape, and more lawsuits. Please join me in voting NO on Measure 37.

Thank you,
Pete Sorenson

PS - If you have any questions about the seriousness of this measure and why I oppose it, please contact me PO Box 10836, Eugene, Oregon 97440 or by calling me at (541) 485-6726 or by sending me an email at sorenson2004@juno.com

(This information furnished by Peter Sorenson.)

Argument in Opposition

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 37

The American Institute of Architects Oregon Chapter is made up of individuals from throughout the state who depend on development and construction. We believe that measure 37 is an attack on the orderly development that is important for the quality of life enjoyed by Oregonians.

MEASURE 37 WILL DISCOURAGE INVESTMENT IN OREGON

Taxpayers can't afford the potential costs imposed by measure 37, and the alternative under 37 is to "forgo enforcement" of our land use regulations. A business needs to know that investment in a new factory or office will be secure before that investment will be made. Our land use regulations provide this security; measure 37 takes it away.

MEASURE 37 WILL UNDERMINE HOME AND NEIGHBORHOOD VALUES

Our land use regulations provide stability for home values and neighborhood livability. Investment in home and neighborhood improvement will be discouraged if one property owner can decrease neighbors' property values by turning a home into a commercial use. Would anyone pay you as much for your home if your neighbor could decide next week to sell used cars in the front yard?

MEASURE 37 IS UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE

Economic windfalls will go to a few large landowners while taxpayers foot the bill and face uncertainty in the value of their homes, neighborhoods and businesses. Large timber, mining and development interests will be released from protecting the environment while the rest of us face higher taxes, instability and uncertainty.

MAINTAIN THE VISION THAT MAKES OREGON SPECIAL

The citizens of Oregon have worked for many years for orderly development that protects the livability of our neighborhoods and safeguards citizens' investments in property. We can continue to improve land use regulation to serve the citizens of Oregon without using Measure 37 like a wrecking ball that would also demolish everything good about our land use regulations.

PLEASE JOIN US TO VOTE NO ON MEASURE 37

American Institute of Architects Oregon Chapter

(This information furnished by Jonathan Stafford, 2004 President, American Institute of Architects Oregon Chapter.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon's Wineries and Grapegrowers Urge Oregonians to Reject Measure 37

Our story is a true Oregon success story. Oregon's farmland preservation laws have helped to protect the land we rely on to grow, make, and market some of the world's best wines. Oregon wines are now recognized and respected around the world, and tourists come to visit us, taste our

wines, and enjoy the beauty of our state. We've created an industry that employs thousands of Oregonians and pumps millions of dollars into our state and local economies.

You don't have to be a wine drinker to appreciate the economic contributions the wine industry brings to our state.

But Ballot Measure 37 is a direct threat to the livelihood of grapegrowers, wineries and farms throughout Oregon.

Measure 37 jeopardizes our land, our industry, and puts thousands of jobs at-risk

Measure 37 creates unnecessary procedures and processes and will give government the choice of eliminating farmland protections.

State and local government will need to create new procedures to process claims and research development standards that existed on land going back more than 50 years.

Measure 37 will lead to more lawsuits and litigation. There are no limits to the number of claims and lawsuits that can be filed under Measure 37. Our businesses and our lands can't afford more legal uncertainties and ambiguities.

Measure 37 puts our economic success story at risk. Oregon's wine industry has helped create good paying jobs throughout Oregon. We're proud of our contribution to our state and local economies. But Measure 37 will make it more difficult for us to do business and continue supporting Oregon's economic recovery.

**Help preserve "vintage" years for Oregon's
farmlands and economy**

Please join us in voting "NO" on 37

David Adelsheim
Adelsheim Vineyard

Doug Tunnell, Proprietor Brickhouse Vineyards

Michael Etzel
Beaux Freres Winery

Harry Peterson-Nedry
Chehalem

Dick and Nancy Ponzi
Ponzi Vineyards

Eric Lemelson
Lemelson Vineyards

Eyrie Vineyard

Oregon Winegrowers Association

(This information furnished by Eric Lemelson, Lemelson Vineyards.)

Argument in Opposition

TEACHERS, PARENTS, AND SCHOOL SUPPORTERS OPPOSE MEASURE 37

With Money So Tight Already, What's Going to Happen to Education?

We've all seen the unfortunate headlines about shortened school years and districts closing days and even weeks early. Our public schools have suffered staff reductions and program cuts across the board. As teachers, parents, and school supporters we have seen the devastating impacts these cuts have on our students and in our classrooms.

Measure 37 costs too much, will force more cuts to education, and takes needed resources out of our classrooms. Our schools and our students can't succeed with fewer school days and less money.

- **Measure 37 will drain badly needed resources from our schools**

We need our tax dollars to go directly into the classroom. We don't need more paperwork and processes that have nothing to do with educating Oregon's children. If Measure 37 passes, it will cost taxpayers up to \$344 million dollars a year and put Oregon's schools at risk for another round of budget cuts.

- **Measure 37 creates more uncertainty and instability for schools**

The last thing our schools need is more uncertainty. Oregon's schools need stability and every child in Oregon deserves a full school year and reasonable class sizes. Measure 37 jeopardizes our ability to provide a quality education for Oregon's children.

- **Measure 37 will lead to more lawsuits and litigation**

No one can say how much Measure 37 will cost in the long run. But it will lead to more litigation and lawsuits. That's money that will have to come

out of other budgets like public education. The schoolchildren of Oregon will get shortchanged...again.

Measure 37 costs too much and it's just too risky for education.

Vote NO on Measure 37.

**Oregon Education Association
American Federation of Teachers-Oregon
Oregon PTA
Coalition for School Funding Now**

(This information furnished by Chris Coughlin.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon's Conservation Community Opposes Measure 37

Measure 37 is a costly bureaucratic can of worms that will drain Oregon's precious tax dollars at a time we can least afford it.

Measure 37 also threatens Oregon's Conservation Legacy

For thirty years, Oregon has built a legacy of using land use safeguards to protect farmland from overdevelopment. We have promoted responsible growth in our cities, while making sure Oregon's prime farmland continues to grow food and crops - helping the economy and environment at the same time.

This measure is a sneaky way to roll back those safeguards for the benefit of a few.

How? By making it impossibly expensive for the state and cities to maintain farmland zoning.

Read the fine print. Measure 37 allows for claims based on regulations passed decades ago, so up to one-half of our prime farmland could see claims. Unless taxpayers come up with hundreds of millions of dollars - or more - we'd see strip malls and big box stores sprouting from our farmland instead of the crops that feed us.

And the measure offers no standards, so **government could decide one thing for your neighbor's property and something totally different for yours**. Big corporations and special interests would see the benefit, while ordinary taxpayers would pay the bill.

Of course, even if we let our farmland get paved over, this measure will still cost taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars just for all the administrative costs, bureaucracy, and lawsuits it would trigger to figure out who's owed what, going back decades.

That's why conservation groups have joined with farmers, businesses, and unions to oppose Measure 37. Join us in voting NO.

The Trust for Public Land
Friends of the Columbia Gorge
Oregon Environmental Council
Coalition for a Livable Future
Oregon Council Trout Unlimited
Oregon League of Conservation Voters
Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition
Oregon State Public Interest Research Group (OSPIRG)
Sierra Club
Tualatin Riverkeepers

(This information furnished by Jonathan Poisner, Executive Director, Oregon League of Conservation Voters.)

Argument in Opposition

AMERICAN FARMLAND TRUST OPPOSES MEASURE 37

Measure 37 Would be Costly and Unfair

American Farmland Trust works in Oregon and across the country to protect agricultural lands and to support their management in a way that is friendly to the environment. We oppose Measure 37 because:

- **Measure 37 creates uncertainty and litigation over land use issues that will make it ever more difficult for farmers to buy and own land.**
- Measure 37 will result in unfair and uneven application of the land use laws that will fragment our agricultural communities and make farming more difficult and less profitable.
- Measure 37 undermines Oregon's laws that protect farmland from overdevelopment, and thereby threatens Oregon's agricultural heritage.
- **Measure 37 creates government bureaucracy and red tape that will result in increased taxes making it even more difficult for farmers to stay in business.**

If Measure 37 becomes law, small family farms in Oregon will suffer. It will become more difficult for new farmers to enter the farming business. A few large, wealthy land-rich farmers who can work the system and hire lawyers might benefit in the short-term by selling off their holdings for development or taking advantage of Oregon taxpayers. But most smaller family farms will suffer. The long-term impact will be to destroy Oregon's

wonderful agricultural economy

Please Vote NO on Measure 37

American Farmland Trust

(This information furnished by Don Stuart, American Farmland Trust.)

Argument in Opposition

OREGON NURSERY OWNERS AND OPERATORS
OPPOSE MEASURE 37

As owners and operators of nurseries, we urge you to VOTE NO ON MEASURE 37 so our industry can continue to thrive and provide jobs for Oregonians.

Nurseries in Oregon are mostly small, owner-operated firms, but our industry is making a big contribution to our state's prosperity. Oregon's fast growing nursery industry is now the largest contributor to our state's \$3.5 billion agricultural economy. In 2002 Oregon trailed only California and Florida in total horticultural production, with a record \$727 million in sales - the 12th straight year of increased sales.

Unlike many other agricultural commodities, most of Oregon's nursery products are grown in counties that also have large urban populations. The top five nursery producing counties in the state are Marion, Clackamas, Washington, Yamhill and Multnomah Counties.

By protecting our industry's land base from uncontrolled urban sprawl, Oregon's land use and farmland protection laws have enabled nurseries to flourish, even in the face of rapid population growth. These laws have been essential to maintaining the basic livelihood of thousands of Oregonians who earn their living in nurseries and other agricultural operations.

MEASURE 37 WOULD HARM OREGON'S NURSERIES

Measure 37 hurts nursery operators and taxpayers by creating layers and layers of new government processes and procedures and rolling back the safeguards that protect Oregon nursery land from over-development. **That's why nursery owners and operators from across the state urge Oregonians to Vote No on Measure 37.**

Alice Doyle and Greg Lee
Log House Plants
Cottage Grove

Bob Iwasaki
Nurseryman
Washington County

Rod Park
Park's Nursery
Gresham

Blooming Nursery
Washington County

Egan Gardens
Salem

(This information furnished by Rod Park, Park's Nursery.)

Argument in Opposition

OREGON CHAPTERS OF THE AUDUBON SOCIETY
URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON MEASURE 37

Should Oregon Taxpayers Pay Millions of Dollars to Create New Government Bureaucracy Required By a Measure that Guarantees Uncertainty and Litigation?

Ballot Measure 37 will cost as much as \$344 million annually, just for state and local governments to set up and operate the program, according to a financial impact analysis conducted by the Oregon Secretary of State, Treasurer and Directors of State Revenue and Administrative Services.

While threatening laws and regulations that protect rivers, wetlands, forests and wildlife, the measure seems bound to generate only uncertainty. The state Attorney General's Office, for example is concerned that the measure will generate legal ambiguities, uncertainty and several areas of significant dispute. (Department of Justice memorandum, July 19, 2004).

The best that anyone can say about the effect of this measure is "no one can say."

- Effect on land outside the UGB?
- Impact on established single-family neighborhoods?
- Ability of governments to pay to waive existing zoning regulations?

NO ONE CAN SAY FOR SURE!

If Measure 37 passes, we lose our ability to keep our communities good places to live--for both wildlife and people.

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON MEASURE 37

Audubon Society of Portland
Audubon Society of Corvallis
Kalmiopsis Audubon Society
Lane County Audubon Society
Salem Audubon Society
Rogue Valley Audubon Society

(This information furnished by Meryl Redisch, Audubon Society of Portland.)

Argument in Opposition

Polk & Yamhill County Farm Bureaus Say "Vote No On 37"

If everyone in Oregon lived on a farm in beautiful Polk or Yamhill County Measure 37 would be easily voted down. In 2003, Polk County farmers sold their crops for \$119 million and Yamhill even more - \$225 million, generating these counties' largest source of private sector income. Farmers spent this income in the community to meet payrolls and pay taxes, and to buy trucks, farm equipment, fuel, seed, supplies, insurance, medical services, groceries, etc., etc. Measure 37 threatens this annual, countywide flow of dollars and the way of life and magnificent countryside that goes along with profitable farming.

Farmers need good soil, good sense, capital, hard work and luck. But farmers also need supportive laws. For 28 years Oregon has had two laws - farm use zoning and special assessment taxation - that strongly support farming. Besides generating costs and bureaucratic red tape for all Oregonians, Measure 37 will ruin these two crucially important farm laws.

Measure 37's talk about compensation is just a "come on" to fool voters into forcing counties to open up rich farmland to speculators and developers, even if a decline in farming would hurt everyone else. Counties don't have the money or the inclination to pay compensation. In either case, Measure 37 requires counties to weaken farmland protections and would be very detrimental to Oregon agriculture.

Please join us in voting "No" on Measure 37.

Dean Freeborn, President
Polk County Farm Bureau
Rickreall

Dave Cruickshank, President
Yamhill County Farm Bureau
McMinnville

(This information furnished by Dean Freeborn, President, Polk County Farm Bureau.)

Argument in Opposition

LINN COUNTY FARM BUREAU OPPOSES MEASURE 37

Overall it will be bad law for family agriculture in Oregon and for Oregonians who have demonstrated that they prefer Oregon produced agricultural products.

Measure 37 would require compensation for land use regulations that restrict the use of private real property but provides no funding for that compensation. Governmental bodies faced with a compensation demand can opt out of applying the established land use laws to placate that demand. That is just what will happen.

Measure 37 is not about compensation, it is about severely degrading thirty years of relative stability for Oregon agriculture.

Oregon agriculture requires a stable land base. Measure 37 will destabilize that foundation. Commercial agriculture will be reluctant to commit the money, time, and equipment to continue creating food and fiber without the expectation that they will not have to deal with the problems generated by non-resource demands in resource zones.

Agriculture is more than just yearly crops. It is a multi-generation commitment. Measure 37 destroys the stability that nurtures this commitment.

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 37

LINN COUNTY FARM BUREAU

Dan Thackaberry, President
Lebanon

(This information furnished by Dan Thackaberry, Linn County Farm Bureau.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Family Farms Oppose Measure #37

As family farmers and ranchers from every corner of Oregon, we respectfully ask our fellow Oregonians to VOTE NO ON Measure #37 to protect Oregon's farm, ranch and forest land.

Jim Monroe
Sheep, Timber
Linn County

Judson Parsons
Timber, Hay, Grain
Jackson County

Kenagy Family Farm, Inc.
Benton County

Diana Gardener
Hardwoods
Marion County

David Vanasche, Owner
Vanasche Farm
Washington County

Jim and Margaret Wood
Cattle, Horses, Timber
Crook County

J & T Farms
Vegetable Seed, Grass Seed, Hay
Grain, Horse Stables
Marion County

Richard Holcomb
Cattle, Timber
Douglas County

Larry Pearmine
Vegetable Crops, Grass Seed, Cherries
Marion County

Gary L. Harris
Onion & Carrot Seed
Jefferson County

(This information furnished by Jim Wood.)

Argument in Opposition

The Human Services Coalition of Oregon Urges a NO Vote on Measure 37

A weak economy has hurt a lot of children and families in Oregon:

- Working parents can barely afford health care and child care.
- Food pantries and soup kitchens are maxed out.
- Fewer services and programs are available for mental and chemical dependency treatment.
- Our most vulnerable citizens, the elderly and disabled, are stretched to the breaking point.

The **Human Services Coalition of Oregon** includes hundreds of human services providers, associations, county agencies and individuals working together to ensure the very basic needs of Oregon's poorest and most vulnerable residents are met.

We have studied Measure 37 and believe it is a bad deal for Oregon:

- **Measure 37 creates unnecessary government bureaucracy and red-tape.**
- **Measure 37 will mean more cuts for important health care programs, senior services, tobacco prevention and other critical services.**
- **Measure 37 will cost Oregon taxpayers and businesses up to \$344 million dollars a year just to pay for new processes and paperwork.**

It's time to make Oregon the great place we know it can be. But we can't do those things if Measure 37 becomes law.

Please vote 'No' on Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Phil Donovan, Human Services Coalition of Oregon.)

A

Argument in Opposition

Measure 37 is harmful to our heritage

Oregonians are justifiably proud of our history and heritage. We've worked hard to preserve historic resources in our downtowns, neighborhoods, and in the rural areas of the state. However, Measure 37 endangers the ability to preserve and protect our cultural heritage. That's why we are opposed to it.

None of us like regulations, and Measure 37 is a regulation of the worst kind- unnecessary and harmful, wasteful and bureaucratic. Put into place, Measure 37 will burden our communities with extra costs and layers of bureaucracy and leave us nothing in return.

The tools that now help preserve Oregon's heritage resources will be undermined and irreparably harmed if Measure 37 is put into place. Cherished historic resources that have come to symbolize the identity of our communities could disappear, only to be replaced by new construction, developments, parking lots, and unchecked development. Not only could these irreplaceable historic resources be eliminated, the livability of our state, the very reason people live in and visit Oregon, could be compromised.

Despite what others may say, Measure 37 could actually endanger property values by stripping property owners of longstanding protections that help preserve our cultural heritage. Existing zoning protections could be replaced with regulations that allow uncontrolled sprawl and development, destroying the historic fabric of our neighborhoods and communities. If enacted, local governments could be faced with the prospect of either protecting our state's heritage or paying someone thousands of dollars not to build a retail superstore in your neighborhood.

Let's not saddle ourselves with unnecessary and harmful legislation that will compromise Oregon's irreplaceable cultural resources and lead to an unstable, uncertain, and costly future. Join us in voting no on Measure 37.

Michael Teskey, president
Historic Preservation League of Oregon
www.hplo.org

Stephen Poyser, president
Oregon Preservation Alliance
www.oregonpreservation.org

(This information furnished by Michael Teskey, President, Historic Preservation League of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

City Club of Portland Opposes Measure 37

The City Club of Portland is a nonprofit organization established to inform the community of public matters. We strongly oppose Measure 37 based on past City Club research and recommendations. After 15 months of study by an objective research committee screened for conflict of interest, members agreed with their recommendations that certain principles should guide compensation policies developed through legislative or initiative processes. Oregon's planning program is a successful tool for accomplishing many goals that are in the public's interest. We oppose the measure because of the following as expressed in the original City Club report:

- If a compensation scheme is presented to voters, it should include a corresponding **funding mechanism**.
- If government is required to pay compensation to a property owner, it should acquire an enforceable property-related right.
- Only losses of value above a certain threshold should be eligible for compensation.
- Compensation for losses by regulatory takings should be funded, to the extent practicable, by revenue generated from property owners who benefit from changes in land use regulation.

The City Club also recommends that the Governor and Legislature begin a **public** process to identify the appropriate balance between property rights and community interests. They should use input from this process to work with interested and affected parties to craft and implement a statutory compensation program that follows the principles described above.

Measure 37 is inconsistent with the City Club's principles, particularly those requiring an **adequate funding mechanism**. No funding mechanism is associated with Measure 37. We urge the people of Oregon to vote No on this costly measure.

(This information furnished by Arnold Cogan, The City Club of Portland.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 37: Another Flawed Initiative

Working Oregonians have faced an incredible burden the past few years. The highest unemployment rate in the nation, higher prices for necessities like prescription drugs and gasoline, and longer hours for less pay. The last thing we need is another flawed ballot measure that makes it harder for families to get ahead

Measure 37: The Supreme Court Already Threw Out a Similar Measure

This measure is flawed and so full of loopholes and fine print that it will lead to more lawsuits and litigation. Measure 37 will bury the average Oregonian knee deep in red tape and paperwork.

Measure 37: A Costly Burden For Working Families

Don't forgot that it will cost up to \$344 million dollars a year just to pay for the paperwork associated with this measure. That's money that has to come from somewhere. Public education, health care, and public safety will face more rollbacks and reductions if this measure passes. And Oregon families can't afford that.

Measure 37: Harder to Protect the Value of Your Home

Still think this won't affect you? This measure creates new rules that say you might not receive any notice and won't have any say if the government decides to allow some of your neighbors to develop their property any way they want. And that's not fair.

Families Can't Afford Another Flawed Ballot Measure

Join us and Vote NO on 37

SEIU Local 503, OPEU
www.SEIU503.org

(This information furnished by Arthur Towers, Service Employees International Union Local 503, OPEU.)

Argument in Opposition

**AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY
AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION
AMERICAN LUNG ASSOCIATION**

Urge you to Vote "NO" on Measure 37

Measure 37 Will Harm Important Health Programs:

Programs to reduce heart disease, lung disease and cancer will be harmed by Measure 37, because the measure's high administrative costs will force cuts in important public health programs in Oregon.

Measure 37 creates layers of processes and procedures that will cost taxpayers money, but the measure "provides no new revenue source for payments."

Where's the money going to come from for more than \$300 million of administrative costs per year and even more to pay claims?

Measure 37 Will Cause More Cuts to Basic Services:

State and local agencies will be forced to make severe cuts across the board. That means:

- More cuts to the Oregon Health Plan
- More cuts to tobacco prevention
- More cuts to senior services
- More cuts to other important public health programs

ALL just to cover the new costs associated with Measure 37!

Measure 37 Lacks Clarity...Yet Another Measure that Says One Thing But Does Something Else:

Another problem with Measure 37 is a vague exemption clause for issues of public health. The clause lacks clarity with regard to whether protecting workers from the hazards of secondhand smoke would fall under this exemption.

Under Measure 37, there is the potential that businesses could file a claim due to state and local clean indoor air regulations. Case-by-case decisions that businesses are exempt from smokefree workplace laws would undermine the laws' effectiveness and complicate enforcement.

Measure 37 is bad for Public Health and bad for Oregon.

Please Join Us in Voting NO on 37!

American Cancer Society
American Heart Association
American Lung Association

(This information furnished by John Valley, American Heart Association.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association Opposes Measure 37

The Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association urges Oregonians to vote No on this measure:

- It will undo farmland protections
- It will take millions of dollars to implement
- The full costs are not known
- No revenue sources are identified
- It is unfair; the new rules will pit neighbor against neighbor, business owner against business owner

Attorney General Hardy Myers' office has warned that Measure 37 was fraught with "**uncertainty**", and would result in "**significant disputes**" over its effects. (Department of Justice memorandum, July 19, 2004). We agree. Measure 37 would set back years of Oregonians' efforts to protect farmland and improve housing, transportation, and economic development in our communities. Passage would be costly and create chaos.

According to official estimates, the uncertainties in this measure would **cost Oregon taxpayers** up to \$344,000,000 in the **first year alone**. This is an assault on Oregonians' quality of life and pocketbooks. No new revenue sources are identified to pay for the cost of administration and according to the state, full costs "cannot be determined".

The measure would create new sets of rules - differing for nearly every property in the state. Measures to protect property values would be waived or not enforced.

All Oregonians lose if Measure 37 passes. Decisions about how to use our property will be made by the courts after costly lawsuits instead of by the people. At a time when resources are already scarce, Oregon doesn't need this mess.

The Oregon Chapter of the American Planning Association exists to protect the legacy of our natural environment, improve the physical environment, foster social and environmental equity, and advocate for citizens' ability to participate. Our more than 800 volunteer and professional planners are dedicated to maintaining and improving the quality of life in Oregon.

Vote No on Measure 37.

(This information furnished by Robert E. Clay, Oregon Chapter, American Planning Association.)

Argument in Opposition

No On 37 It's Bad for Oregon It's Bad for Taxpayers

Oregon's land use planning laws protect Oregon's heritage and strengthen Oregon's future. Measure 37 is a dangerous threat to those laws-**a threat we can't afford.**

Measure 37 will force communities across Oregon to choose: either pay developers not to build, or grant exemptions to the rules the rest of us follow. Either way, the choice will cost taxpayers dearly.

Worse, it will cost us all **millions** just for government to investigate claims, establish procedures, and make the decisions required by this poorly written, ill-conceived measure. The official fiscal impact analysis says Measure 37 **will cost up to \$344 million every year** for paperwork alone, before a single claim is paid.

Measure 37 is a blank check, drawing on the resources of every town and county in our State. Oregon's taxpayers can't afford that bill. And we

can't afford losing our farm and forest lands, our spectacular coastline, or our own neighborhoods.

That's why we're joining with **1000 Friends of Oregon**
to urge you to **VOTE NO on MEASURE 37.**

Matt Hennessee
CEO, QuikTrak, Inc.
Portland

Henry C. Lorenzen
H & C Lorenzen Farm
Member, State Board of Higher Education
Pendleton

Hector Macpherson
Bannockburn Farms
Oregon State Senator, 1971-75
Albany

Denyse C. McGriff
Board President, 1000 Friends of Oregon
Oregon City

Norma Paulus
Oregon Secretary of State, 1977-85
Portland

Dick Ponzi
Ponzi Vineyards
Gaston

Barbara Roberts
Governor of Oregon, 1991-95
Portland

Homer Williams
Williams & Dame
Portland

(This information furnished by Bob Stacey, Executive Director, 1000 Friends of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

THE NATURE CONSERVANCY URGES YOU TO VOTE NO ON MEASURE 37

The Nature Conservancy is a private, non-profit land conservation organization devoted to protecting important habitats through land stewardship and cooperative partnerships

IF MEASURE 37 PASSES, THE RESULTS WILL BE:

- YEARS OF UNCERTAINTY
- COMPLEX COURT CASES
- NEW LAYERS OF GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY
- UP TO \$344 MILLION A YEAR IN COSTS TO TAXPAYERS

Oregon's natural heritage is at risk. The efforts of thousands of Oregonians working to save important natural treasures will be disrupted.

The Nature Conservancy believes strongly in private property rights. Through the free market we have protected over 175,000 acres at 110 places throughout Oregon.

We support fair and balanced land use planning and habitat protection laws.

Measure 37 will replace common sense rules protecting fish and wildlife with cumbersome bureaucracy and red tape.

Oregonians care about protecting our natural resources. Many are hard at work volunteering to restore habitats and conserve forests, farms and ranches. We're preserving these natural treasures in the best Oregon tradition.

Measure 37 will unravel decades of voluntary conservation work in hundreds of communities across Oregon.

Measure 37 will take conservation decisions out of the hands of the public and into the hands of the courts.

We can't take our rich natural heritage for granted. Purchasing critical parcels for protection, managing important habitats for fish and wildlife, protecting water quality, restoring rivers and wetlands, protecting our farms and forests - these are critical investments we must continue to make for Oregon's future.

Measure 37 will cost hundreds of millions of dollars, taking dollars away from schools, health care and public safety. Oregon's investments in conservation will be severely handicapped.

Our board of trustees respectfully urges voters to say NO to Measure 37.

Russell Hoeflich, Oregon Director
Tom Imeson, Chair, Oregon Board of Trustees
Robert Gootee, Vice Chair
Richard Reiten, Vice Chair
Dolorosa Margulis, Treasurer
Peter McDonald, Secretary
Carter MacNichol, Chair Emeritus

(This information furnished by Russell Hoeflich, Oregon Director, The Nature Conservancy.)

Argument in Opposition

For goodness sakes, VOTE NO on Measure 37 and help head off a statewide disaster. If passed into law, this innocent-appearing measure could disrupt and disorganize the now quiet, peaceful residential zones by allowing factories and other uses allowed years ago but are now banned. Property that has been in the same ownership for many years will be eligible for compensation for the down zoning that has occurred or be allowed to use the property according to what was allowed at the time of purchase. There is not enough money in sight to pay off for downzoning, so the previous right would have to be allowed.

The same is true for the Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zones. Sporadic housing and other uses now banned would spring up in the EFU zones. The only criteria here again for compensation or change of use is the length of continuous ownership - no consideration is given for availability of water, type of soil or drainage. This also could cause a shift in school populations and create problems for fire protection and police patrol. The final result would be the destruction of many of the EFU zones right in the best farming areas.

If passed, this measure would financially benefit a few and terribly damage many. Our beautiful State of Oregon would be damaged for lack of organized land use planning that goes along with civilization. What we have is not perfect, but it is certainly better than the statewide disaster that the enactment of Measure 37 into law would cause.

Jack R. Chapin

(This information furnished by Jack R. Chapin.)

Argument in Opposition

Homeowners Oppose Measure 37

Protect Private Property Rights

What will happen to your home or your property when government can change the regulations and rules as they go along?

Measure 37 is so poorly written it allows government to decide one thing for your neighbor's property and something totally different for yours.

And that's just wrong. Treating homeowners and property owners fairly is the foundation of our country.

Please join us in voting "No" on Measure 37.

Nancy Thompson 176th Court, Beaverton

Shelly Wetherell and
Mike Wetherell
Mode Road, Umpqua

Bob Delong
Summer St. NE, Salem

Ronald A. Buel
Washington Street, Manzanita

Marcello Napolitano
SW Borwick Rd, Hillsboro

David P. Miller
NW Brugger Road, Portland

Mark Tipperman McIntyre Road, La Grande

Liz Frenkel
NW Vista Pl, Corvallis

David Ausherman
Upper Drive, Portland SE

Kasandra Griffin

34th Avenue, Portland

William Boyer
Jordan Rd, Sisters

Laurel Hines
Lake Drive, Salem

Douglas Holbrook
8th Street, Lincoln City

Kassetra Stevenson
North Heights Drive, Albany

Camille Hall
Mountain View Drive, Corvallis

James H. Hicks
Mason St, Portland

Julie Sterling
Myrtle Street, Portland

James Wodarczak
Ripplewood Drive, Yamhill

Henry M. Reeves and Marilyn Reeves
Boulder Creek Lane, Amity

Betty Wodarczak
Ripplewood Drive, Yamhill

Mary Koehler
5th Avenue, Hillsboro

Jim Just
Almen Drive, Lebanon

Tonya Graham
Lit Way, Ashland

Ray Thorp
Van Pelt Drive, Brookings

Josie G. Mendoza
Terrace Drive, Lake Oswego

Cheryl Thorp
Van Pelt Drive, Brookings

Megan Knight
SW 182nd Terrace, Beaverton

Eleanor L. Pearson
SE Division Street, Portland

Cindy Deacon Williams
Pioneer Road, Medford

Lisa Hargrave
May Street, Hood River

(This information furnished by Kassetra Stevenson, Albany.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 37 is not about property rights or compensation for loss of use of property. This measure's sole motive is to destroy land use planning or protective zoning in all areas of the State of Oregon.

Under this measure, unless a filed claim is compensated for a perceived loss of value in their property because of its zoning, the filer, in many cases may use their property as it was zoned or not zoned when acquired by them or their forefathers. Compensation is impracticable, without large increases in taxes, so current ordinances and laws that cover that property could be waived.

A residential zone could even be infiltrated by commercial or industrial uses by property owners who held that property before it was zoned as it is now.

It is important to remember zoning gives protection and surety whether owning or acquiring new property. Oregon has developed and pioneered a valuable land use planning system. Don't let it be destroyed by this measure, which would allow certain holders of property to do as they please

with their property, which may infringe on your rights. Property rights have two sides; zoning may tend to restrict but it also protects from others harmful actions.

Remember, zoning allows you full use of your property within the zone it is situated. Farmers in exclusive farm use zones are free to farm and have been compensated by property tax considerations for keeping their land in agriculture. Let us keep our environment that we all enjoy and use. Land use planning in Oregon has been upheld by courts and by statewide votes in the past. Do not destroy the system by passage of this measure.

Let's keep Oregon Oregon!

Marion County Farm Bureau

(This information furnished by Larry Wells, President, Board of Directors, Marion County Farm Bureau.)

Argument in Opposition

Business Leaders Say NO to Measure 37

The Oregon Business Association is a bi-partisan business organization representing over 250 companies-large and small-across Oregon.

We strongly oppose Measure 37!

- **Measure 37 will create too many complex layers of new government!**

As business people, we expect state and local governments to be as streamlined and efficient as possible. Yet Measure 37 will require over 300 government entities and agencies to create new processes, new procedures and new paperwork just to deal with the bureaucracy mandated by the measure.

- **Measure 37 creates a bureaucratic nightmare, adding significant costs to taxpayers!**

As business people, we carefully evaluate the costs and risks of any new project we may undertake. After looking closely at Measure 37, we believe it is too risky. We know it will cost taxpayers and businesses up to \$344 million dollars a year just to deal with the paperwork and red tape. But the state's fiscal analysis concludes that the final cost to businesses and tax- payers "cannot be determined".

- **Measure 37 will lead to numerous lawsuits and litigation!**

As business people, we support a balanced economy in Oregon, including manufacturing, technology, natural resources, and agriculture.

Measure 37 will hurt our economy because it is too complex, too vague and will result in numerous legal challenges-costing taxpayers, flooding the courts, and elimi-nating the safeguards that protect Oregon businesses and Oregon farmers.

Join business leaders, small business owners and County Farm Bureaus across the state working to protect and enhance Oregon's economy.

VOTE NO ON MEASURE 37!

Submitted by:

Lynn Lundquist, President, Oregon Business Association

Tom Kelly, President, Neil Kelly Construction, Inc. (founding Board Chair of OBA)

Jim Kelly

James A. Zehren

Michael Powell

Kevin A. Lynch

Mark A. Long

Nik Blosser

John W. Russell- President, Russell Development

John Emrick- President and CEO, Norm Thompson

Paul Burnet- CH2M HILL

Stephen J. Petruzelli

(This information furnished by Lynn Lundquist, President, Oregon Business Association; Tom Kelly, President, Neil Kelly Construction, Inc., founding Board Chair, OBA.)

Argument in Opposition

Former Governor Kitzhaber warns.

"This measure was flawed before and it is flawed again."

They're back.

In 2002 while I was Governor, the Supreme Court threw out the last ballot measure drafted by the same people who bring you Measure 37.

That measure was flawed and so is Measure 37.

And just this July, the Oregon Attorney General's office wrote an analysis of the likely effects of their new initiative. That analysis found "uncertainty," "significant ambiguities" and "areas of dispute" within the new measure. (Department of Justice memorandum, July 19, 2004).

And in their recent editorial against Measure 37 the Medford *Mail Tribune* wrote,

"It would open the floodgates to land-use lawsuits, degrade the livability of our state and force local governments to cut existing services or raise taxes to pay the costs."

Medford *Mail Tribune*, July 6, 2004

Measure 37 is a mess. It is poorly written and full of loopholes. It creates all sorts of uncertainties for property owners. For example, the measure says government can decide one thing for your neighbor's property and something entirely different for yours!

One thing is certain, **Measure 37 means more legal challenges, more litigation, and more lawsuits.** Local permit processes will be stopped in their tracks while our courts are tied up with lawsuits.

Please vote "No" on Measure 37.

Former Governor Kitzhaber

(This information furnished by John Kitzhaber, M.D.)

Argument in Opposition

Vote No on #37

- As farmers and ranchers we are the true stewards of the land and this measure will not benefit agriculture's land use protections. Measure 37 is all about destroying wise land use planning, and not true compensation for property rights takings. Oregon taxpayers do not have, and will not have the financial resources to fund this measure.
- Like farmers throughout Oregon, Jefferson and Grant county farmers rely on stable agricultural zones to continue to thrive and flourish. The irrigated lands have good soils, valuable water rights, and farm use taxation. If measure 37 passes farmland owners will have a different set of land use regulations, depending upon their or their ancestors date of purchase. This will result in total chaos, numerous conflicts, and endless litigation. This is exactly what measure 37 proposes. Creating a reckless, wasteful policy resulting in lawyers being the true beneficiaries, not the citizens of Oregon.
- Recently, Madras residents were opposed to a feedlot 1.5 miles away in an agricultural zone. If measure 37 passes, a feedlot could be next door. Just as farmers expect zones free of urban sprawl and conflicts, suburban home owners should demand the continuation of residential zones free from agricultural and industrial hazards and nuisances. Passage of measure 37 would jeopardize the safe guards of zoning.

- The sum total of every property owner's desires is more than society can afford. To allow a house on any hill or every parcel would quickly exhaust all public dollars for roads, mail service, school busing, fire protection, law enforcement, and utilities. The vast rangeland areas of Jefferson and Grant counties should remain working ranches!
- The compensation clause will not apply to any federal rules and/or regulations or health and safety issues.

Jefferson County Farm Bureau and Grant County Farm Bureau oppose measure 37. We encourage not only our members, but every Oregonian to vote this measure down.

(This information furnished by Mickey Killingsworth, Secretary-Treasurer, Jefferson County Farm Bureau; Grant County Farm Bureau.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon AFL-CIO Opposes Measure 37's Special Rights for Favored Property Owners

Don't be misled by the slick title that headlines Ballot Measure 37. We took a closer look and found that the effects of Measure 37 are far more complicated and dangerous than its title suggests.

Measure 37 Creates Special Rights for Favored Property Owners

Measure 37 will create a new class of favored property owners with special rights. Those rights include the right to challenge cities and counties that attempt to enforce zoning and land use laws and to demand payments for such enforcement. But only some property owners will gain these rights; others will not.

Measure 37 Overrides Equal Application of Our Laws

For property owners who gain these special rights, cities and counties will be forced to decide when to enforce our laws and pay what those property owners demand and when to exempt those property owners from the equal application of our laws.

Measure 37 Will Allow Big Corporations to Ride Roughshod Over Local Communities

Wealthy corporations that team up with favored property owners are certain to use Measure 37 to their advantage.

Recently, Wal-Mart tried and failed to overcome community opposition to building new super-centers in Hillsboro and Oregon City. But projects like those will be much more difficult to stop if Measure 37 becomes law.

Measure 37 will allow "big-box retailers" like Wal-Mart to partner with local landowners and challenge community zoning laws wherever they want

to build new mega-stores. Once corporations like Wal-Mart can demand budget-busting payments from local taxpayers just for complying with our laws, they will be able to ride roughshod over our communities, displace local businesses and undermine good-paying jobs around the state.

Say No to special rights for favored property owners. Defend the equal application of our laws. Protect our jobs and our communities. Please join us in voting No on Measure 37.

Tim Nesbitt
President
Oregon AFL-CIO

Brad Witt
Secretary-Treasurer
Oregon AFL-CIO

(This information furnished by Tim Nesbitt, President, Oregon AFL-CIO.)

Argument in Opposition

Protect Your Neighborhood and the Value of Your Home Vote No! on Measure 37

Like most Oregonians, you probably live in a quiet residential neighborhood-something you cherish and something the value of your home depends upon.

What is it that prevents someone from building a 24-hour mini-mart or gas station next door to you; what is it that prevents him or her from blighting your neighborhood and destroying the value of your home? The answer is reasonable zoning regulations.

That's what Measure 37 seeks to destroy: your lifestyle, your neighborhood, and the value of your home.

Measure 37 is designed to pave the way for the corporation or landowner who wants to build that 24-hour mini-mart or gas station. But what about you and your home! That 24-hour mini-mart or gas station will reduce the value of your home and ruin everything you treasure about your neighborhood. If Measure 37 is in place, you may find the zoning you rely upon won't be there to protect you. Reasonable zoning regulations are what preserve and protect our neighborhoods and the value of our homes. Don't turn our cities into Houston. Measure 37 is bad for you, your neighborhood, and Oregon.

Protect Your Neighborhood and the Value of Your Home Vote No! on Measure 37

(This information furnished by John W. Stephens.)