

# Central Catholic High School

## 2018 Voter Forum Report

Dear families, alumni, faculty, staff and other members of the Central Catholic community:

The seniors of the Central Catholic High School U.S. Government classes are excited to share the results of our Voter Forums with you. After researching and discussing five measures on the Oregon ballot this year, students assessed which arguments were most persuasive. We are pleased to share our results with you today.

During the Voter Forums, students engaged in the hard work of democracy by researching and presenting the arguments put forth on both sides of five ballot measures. As part of the process, we practiced actively listening to both sides of an argument and engaging in respectful, civil discourse. We discussed what it means to be a voter and to make decisions with imperfect information. We weighed contradictory arguments and sources of information. We identified the questions we still had after reviewing the Oregon Voters Pamphlet, newspaper articles and editorials, campaign websites and other materials. And we engaged other classes, parents, teachers and visitors in our conversations to broaden our viewpoints.

The end result is a CCHS Voter Forum Report that lists the arguments the seniors found to be most persuasive on both sides of the ballot measures we examined. We hope it will be a helpful source of information as you review your ballot this year.

Please note that we do not endorse any measures or candidates. We are not fact checkers and did not attempt to verify the accuracy of any statements made in the Oregon Voters Pamphlet or other sources. We are providing links to our sources so you can assess the quality of information presented and continue the Voter Forum discussions in your own homes. In addition to measure-specific sources, links to most of the general information resources students used are available through the Central Catholic library website at: <http://libguides.centralcatholichigh.org/voterforum18>

Thank you for your continued support as we help our students become active citizens.

Sincerely,

Geoff Stuckart  
U.S. Government teacher  
Social Studies Dept. Co-Chair

Steve Halligan  
AP U.S. Government teacher  
Social Studies Dept. Co-Chair

John Guthrie  
U.S. Government teacher

## Measure 103

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

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

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

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

Arguments in Favor	Arguments in Opposition
A grocery tax would mostly impact lower-income families, military families, and senior citizens.	The terms "grocery" and "grocer" are too broad and not clearly defined in the measure.
If a grocery tax was passed, people would look for cheaper food to save money. Cheaper food generally leads to unhealthy choices.	There is currently no sales tax or grocery tax, so a no vote would keep things the way they are now.
Passing Measure 103 would not tax local farmers, who are some of the major contributors to the supermarket and where the majority of food comes from.	The measure's definition of "groceries" does not include medicine, diapers, toilet paper or other essentials, which leaves those items vulnerable to future taxes.
Keeping food prices low and not adding a tax gives everyone access to better food.	The measure is unnecessary and dangerously preemptive. There is no current proposal to tax groceries in the future.
Passing this measure as an amendment to the Oregon Constitution is good because it will prevent the Oregon Legislature from changing it or eliminating it in the future.	Passing this measure as an amendment to the Oregon Constitution is bad because it would be very difficult to change it or fix it. A no vote would keep everything as it is.
Oregonians have made it clear they do not want a sales tax.	Measure 103 takes away local cities' right to add a tax even if the people want one. This tax restriction could prevent us from having the funding to address future problems.

Links to Measure 103 resources (through the Central Catholic library website):

<http://libguides.centralcatholichigh.org/voterforum18/OR103>

## Measure 105

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

**Result of “Yes” Vote:** "Yes" vote repeals law limiting (with exceptions) use of state/local law enforcement resources for detecting/apprehending persons suspected only of violating federal immigration laws.

**Result of “No” Vote:** "No" vote retains law limiting (with exceptions) use of state /local law enforcement resources for detecting/apprehending persons suspected only of violating federal immigration laws.

**Summary:** Measure repeals ORS 181A.820, which limits (with exceptions) the use of state and local law enforcement money, equipment and personnel for “detecting or apprehending persons whose only violation of law” pertains to their immigration status. Current exceptions allow using law enforcement resources to: Detect or apprehend persons accused of violating federal immigration laws who are also accused of other violations of law;

- Detect or apprehend persons accused of violating federal immigration laws who are also accused of other violations of law;
- Arrest persons “charged by the United States with a criminal violation of federal immigration laws” who are “subject to arrest for the crime pursuant to a warrant of arrest issued by a federal magistrate”;
- Communicate with federal immigration authorities to verify immigration status of arrested persons or “request criminal investigation information with reference to persons named in records of” federal immigration officials.

Arguments in Favor	Arguments in Opposition
We do not know the criminal records of the 146,000 illegal immigrants currently in Oregon.	The original law was bipartisan and passed with almost unanimous support from both Democrats and Republicans.
Our taxes are protecting illegal immigrants and criminals.	If Measure 105 passes, people of color would be less likely to report crimes and would live in fear of being harassed or questioned.
Only 3.2% of the Oregon population is illegal immigrants but 25% of agricultural and manufacturing jobs are filled by illegal immigrants.	It would lead to increased racial profiling, racism, and civil rights violations.
Last year illegal immigrants cost Oregon taxpayers roughly \$1.22 billion.	Getting rid of the sanctuary law would increase the risk of separating children from their families.
Sanctuary State/City policies violate federal law and the concept of rule of law.	Law enforcement would spend their time on immigration issues, which is a federal issue, rather than on local law enforcement issues.
Measure 105 would allow us to coordinate our federal and local law enforcement activities.	Oregon taxpayers’ money would go to training police officers to deport someone rather than to training them for local law enforcement needs.

Links to Measure 105 resources (through the Central Catholic library website):

<http://libguides.centralcatholichigh.org/voterforum18/OR105>

## Measure 106

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

**Result of "Yes" Vote:** "Yes" vote amends constitution, prohibits spending "public funds" (defined) directly/indirectly for any "abortion" (defined), health plans/insurance covering "abortion"; limited exceptions; reduces abortion access.

**Result of "No" Vote:** "No" vote retains current law that places no restrictions on spending public funds for abortion or health plans covering abortion when approved by medical professional.

**Summary:** Amends Constitution. Under current law, abortions may be obtained, when approved by medical professional, under state-funded health plans or under health insurance procured by or through public employer or other public service. Measure amends constitution to prohibit spending "public funds" (defined) for "abortion" (defined) or health benefit plans that cover "abortion." Measure defines "abortion," in part, as "purposeful termination of a clinically diagnosed pregnancy." Exception for ectopic pregnancy and for pregnant woman in danger of death due to her physical condition. Exception for spending required by federal law, if requirement is "found to be constitutional." No exception for pregnancies resulting from rape/incest unless federal law requires. Effect on spending by public entities other than state unclear. Measure reduces access to abortion. Other provisions

<b>Arguments in Favor</b>	<b>Arguments in Opposition</b>
In Oregon, \$1.7 million in taxpayers' money goes toward abortions annually.	Passing Measure 106 would result in unsafe abortions.
Medically-necessary abortions and abortions in cases of rape and incest would still be eligible for public funding.	Oregon is currently spending approximately \$2 million dollars on abortions annually. If Measure 106 passes, the cost to taxpayers for additional medical services (prenatal care, delivery, etc.) would increase to \$10 million annually.
Currently, Oregon taxpayers have to pay for abortions even if they do not believe in abortions. Abortions are a health choice and not health care.	Even though abortions would not be illegal if Measure 106 passes, they would be extremely hard to access for some people because they would not be able to afford them. This measure would effectively prohibit low-income women from having the choice to have an abortion. A right is not a right if people cannot afford to access it.
Oregon has the fewest restrictions on abortion of any state in the U.S.	Unplanned parenthood is one of the main reasons girls drop out and do not graduate from high school.
Nationally, 32 of 50 states have limited public funding for abortions to emergencies only.	What a woman does with her body is her choice and her choice alone.

Links to Measure 106 resources (through the Central Catholic library website):

<http://libguides.centralcatholichigh.org/voterforum18/OR106>

## Measure 26-199

### **Bonds to fund affordable housing in Washington, Clackamas, Multnomah counties.**

**Question:** Shall Metro issue bonds, fund affordable housing for low-income families, seniors, veterans, people with disabilities; require independent oversight, annual audits?

**Summary:** Measure authorizes \$652.8 million in general obligation bonds to fund affordable housing in Washington, Clackamas, and Multnomah counties.

Bonds will be used to build affordable housing for low-income households; purchase, rehabilitate, and preserve affordability of existing housing; buy land for affordable housing; help prevent displacement.

Affordable housing means land and improvements for residential units occupied by low-income households making 80% or less of area median income, which in 2018 for a family of four was \$65,120; improvements may include a mix of unit sizes, spaces for community and resident needs and services. Some units will be accessible for people with disabilities and seniors; flexibility for existing tenants and hardship.

Requires community oversight and independent financial audits. Creates affordable housing function for Metro, implemented by Metro and local housing partners. Local and regional administrative costs capped at 5% of bond proceeds. Bond costs estimated at \$0.24 per \$1,000 of assessed value annually, approximately \$5.00/month for the average homeowner. Bonds may be issued over time in multiple series.

<b>Arguments in Favor</b>	<b>Arguments in Opposition</b>
This bond will only cost taxpayers \$5 a month to fund affordable housing.	There is no guarantee that the affordable housing units will be distributed among families fairly.
Rent is rising faster than the minimum wage which leaves many families unable to afford rent.	Irresponsible people may be put into the housing and not be able to pay their bills. They may just end up being evicted.
The bond could create between 2,400 and 3,900 new homes and renovate between 7,500 and 12,000 homes for low-income people.	Fifty-eight million dollars was wasted on the Wapato Jail project and it never housed a single criminal, so why would we trust this law to work with our tax money?
Addresses the issue of gentrification by allowing low-income residents to stay in their neighborhoods.	Metro has no experience building homes as well as no authority to build homes.
From 2010-2016, average income increased 19% while the average cost of rent increased 52%.	There would be an increase in property taxes which could then put low-income families out of their homes or make their rent go up.
Fifty percent of the people of Portland pay 30% of their total income on rent.	There are more than 4,000 homeless people, most without an income. Within that number, 1,700 are minors who cannot buy housing.

Links to Measure 26-199 resources (through the Central Catholic library website):

<http://libguides.centralcatholichigh.org/voterforum18/Metro199>

## Measure 26-201

### Imposes surcharge on certain retailers; funds clean energy, job training.

**QUESTION:** Shall large retailers (defined) pay 1% surcharge on Portland revenues to fund clean renewable energy (defined) projects, job training?

**Summary:** Measure amends code to require Portland retailers with total annual revenue over 1 billion dollars and Portland annual revenue over 500,000 dollars to pay 1% surcharge on gross revenue from retail sales (defined) within Portland. Proceeds placed into new Portland Clean Energy Community Benefits Fund. Certain sales of groceries, medicines, health care services excluded from gross revenue.

Measure creates new Portland Clean Energy Community Benefits Fund Committee; will exclusively recommend to Mayor distributions of Fund proceeds as grants to private, Oregon nonprofit organizations, for:

- **Clean Energy Projects (approximately 50-75%):** renewable energy, energy efficiency and green infrastructure projects,
- **Clean Energy Jobs Training (approximately 20-25%):** training that prioritizes workforce development for traditionally underemployed, economically disadvantaged workers,
- **Future Innovation (approximately 5%)**

Arguments in Favor	Arguments in Opposition
Large retailers have a civic responsibility to pay the tax because they contribute the most in terms of carbon emissions.	Portland is already one of the highest taxed cities in the U.S., so adding more taxes could do more harm than good and will hurt low-income families.
Twenty to twenty-five percent of the money collected through this tax (between \$6 and \$7.5 million annually) will go to low-income people and communities of color through job-training programs.	Companies will try to avoid the taxes by moving their company outside of the city limits and taking jobs with them. This measure, if passed, will make Portland less affordable than it already is.
Increasing our use of clean energy will slow climate change. This measure will help Portland reach its ultimate goal of having 100% renewable energy by 2035.	Portland is in the middle of a housing and homelessness crisis. Making people pay for this will make it harder for them to live in Portland.

Links to Measure 26-201 resources (through the Central Catholic library website):

<http://libguides.centralcatholichigh.org/voterforum18/City201>