

5-8-1998

Oregon State Ballot Measure 53: Eliminates "Double Majority" Requirement for Certain Property Tax Measures

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.), "Oregon State Ballot Measure 53: Eliminates "Double Majority" Requirement for Certain Property Tax Measures" (1998). *City Club of Portland*. Paper 488.

http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub/488

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in City Club of Portland by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Oregon State Ballot Measure 53: Eliminates “Double Majority” Requirement for Certain Property Tax Measures

Published in *City Club of Portland Bulletin*
Vol. 79, No. 49, May 8, 1998

Your Committee Found:

In a democratic society, the debate over the question of the appropriate level of governmental activity is inevitable, healthy, legitimate, and perennial. So is the debate over the related question of how to structure a fair and efficient tax system. But while these debates continue, society must continue to govern itself, and must continue to make and implement decisions about schools and parks and roads and airports and public safety. It is not a legitimate part of the democratic process to frustrate the ability of an informed and caring electorate to make those decisions, and the “double majority” requirement implemented by Measures 47 and 50 does just that. It rewards non-participation in the democratic process by giving a veto power to voters who choose not to vote at all in elections to decide certain property tax issues. It is the most extreme example yet of the anti-government bias that has characterized so much of Oregon’s political dialogue in recent years. Furthermore, its implementation imposes extremely cumbersome technical burdens on county clerks. It should be repealed.

Your committee recommends a “Yes” vote on Measure 53.

The City Club membership will vote on this report on Friday, May 8, 1998. Until the membership vote, the City Club of Portland does not have an official position on this report. The outcome of this vote will be reported in the *City Club Bulletin* dated May 29, 1998.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ballot Measure 53 will appear on the ballot as follows:

Caption:	Amends Constitution: Eliminates Voter Turnout Requirement for Passing Certain Property Tax Measures
Result of "Yes" Vote:	"Yes" vote eliminates 50 percent voter participation requirement for passage of certain property tax measures.
Result of "No" Vote:	"No" vote retains 50 percent voter participation requirement for passage of certain property tax measures.
Summary:	Amends constitution. Ballot Measure 50, passed in 1996, allows passage of certain local property tax measures by majority vote only if: at least 50 percent of registered voters cast ballots; or measure is voted upon in a general election held in an even-numbered year. This measure would eliminate the 50 percent voter turnout requirement for all elections held on or after May 19, 1998. Thus, the measure would permit approval of local property tax measures by majority vote regardless of voter turnout.
(The language of the caption, question, and summary was prepared by the Oregon Attorney General.)	

The City Club has a long standing interest in proposals that would institute major changes in Oregon's tax policy and electoral system. While Measure 53 has implications in both areas, your committee focused primarily on the measure's electoral system impacts. The Background Section of this report provides a broad context that highlights a number of issues raised by Measure 53. The Discussion Section focuses on the two specific areas the committee members felt were most important: democratic principles, and the technical challenges of applying the "double majority" requirement. The report closes with the committee's Conclusions and Recommendation.

Your committee met several times over the course of four weeks to study this measure. Committee members were screened prior to their appointment to the committee to ensure that no member had an economic interest in the outcome of the study or had taken a public position on the subject of the measure. The committee interviewed proponents and opponents of the measure and other interested individuals, and reviewed relevant articles, reports, and other materials.

II. BACKGROUND

History of Special Elections in Oregon

Efforts to put limits and controls on special elections in Oregon began decades ago. Early in this century, local taxing districts in Oregon could hold elections on tax measures as frequently as they liked and on any day they chose. Each jurisdiction ran its own election process. One county clerk joked that in the early days, a fire district could pick an election date, put a measure on the ballot, send eight or nine firemen to the polls to vote for it, and get it passed.

Over recent decades, the state legislature has progressively restricted the number of elections that a local jurisdiction can hold in a calendar year—to the present limit of four elections per year. The restricted number of election dates has required jurisdictions to consolidate issues and has reduced election costs.

Today, local taxing districts can put property tax measures on any of four possible election dates each year.

Oregon State Two-Year Election Cycle

Year	March (2nd Tues.)	May (3rd Tues.)	September (3rd Tues.)	November (1st Tues. after the 1st Mon.)
EVEN YEAR	Special	PRIMARY	Special	GENERAL
ODD YEAR	Special	Special	Special	Special

Oregon has over 1,400 taxing districts that raise revenue from local property taxes. All of these districts must meet the current “double majority” requirements when they place a property tax measure on special or primary election ballot. These taxing districts include the state’s 243 cities, 36 counties, 242 schools and educational service districts, 18 community colleges, and 880 special districts that provide a wide range of services related to transportation, health and safety, energy, and the environment.

A Recent Trend to Require Supermajorities

Traditionally in Oregon, both legislative actions and public votes in general, primary, and special elections have been decided by a simple majority. Until 1994, the Oregon Constitution required that "a majority of all the members elected to each House shall be necessary to pass every bill" without exception (Article IV, section 25). State elections laws have required that measures on local government election ballots be "adopted by a majority of votes." (e.g. ORS Chapter 254.065.)

Since 1994, Oregon voters have approved five departures from the state's traditional simple majority rule for elections.

- **1994 Measure 10:** A citizen initiative that amended the state constitution to require a 2/3 vote by the legislature to reduce voter-approved mandatory sentences.
 - **Passed:** YES Votes: 763,507 (65%); NO Votes: 415,678 (35%)
- **1996 Measure 25:** A citizen initiative that amended the state constitution to require a 3/5 vote by the legislature to pass revenue-raising bills.
 - **Passed:** YES Votes: 349,918 (55%); NO Votes: 289,930 (45%)
- **1996 Measure 30:** A citizen initiative that amended the state constitution to require the state to reimburse local governments for the cost of state-mandated programs, and to require a 3/5 vote by the legislature to reduce state revenues that are distributed to local governments.
 - **Passed:** YES Votes: 731,127 (56%); NO Votes: 566,168 (44%)
- **1996 Measure 47:** A citizen initiative that amended the state constitution to limit local property taxes and tax revenues to local government. This measure imposed a 50-percent voter turnout requirement to pass local property tax measures in elections other than a general election in an even-numbered year.
 - **Passed:** YES Votes: 704,554 (52%); NO Votes: 642,613 (48%)
- **1997 Measure 50:** A legislative referral that amended the state constitution to correct problems that had been identified with 1996 Measure 47. This measure retained the "double majority" requirement for local property tax elections in Measure 47.
 - **Passed:** YES Votes: 429,943 (56%); NO Votes: 341,781 (44%)

In the same 1996 election at which Oregon voters approved Measure 47, they voted 88 percent to 12 percent to reject Measure 46. Measure 46 would have required an **affirmative vote** by a **majority of all registered voters** in a taxing district to pass a local property tax measure. In contrast, the "double majority" requirement in Measures 47/50 requires only that 50 percent of the voters participate in a tax measure election in order for the measure to be approved. Thus, under the much higher hurdle proposed in Measure 46, an absolute majority of all registered voters would have been required to approve any tax measure, but under the "double majority" requirement of Measures 47/50, a tax

measure can take effect upon approval of only 25 percent plus one of the registered voters.

Relevant City Club Positions

The City Club has consistently opposed the imposition of different types of supermajority requirements, except in the case of voter passage of state constitutional amendments. The City Club took positions against Measures 25, 30, 46, and 47. The City Club studied but took no position on Measure 50.

The City Club has, in the past, opposed supermajority requirements for local tax measure elections because they could “paralyze local efforts to create new or alternate funding sources,” they are contrary to the principles of representative government in which decisions should be made by a majority of voters, and because they give inappropriate power to a minority of citizens to defeat measures favored by the majority of voters.

What is a “Double Majority”?

The “double majority” provision in Measures 47/50 sets the following requirements to pass local property tax measures:

- at least 50 percent of registered voters in a taxing district must cast ballots, and
- at least a majority (50 percent plus 1) of those voting must vote “Yes” on the measure.

These requirements apply to all local tax elections, except the general election that occurs in November in even-numbered years.

1997 Legislative Session—The Origin of Measure 53

During the 1997 legislative session, a committee of legislators engaged in an extensive process to craft legislation that would correct problems with Measure 47. During that process, a number of legislators—including some who later supported Measure 50—expressed concerns about perceived problems with the “double majority” requirement. Many legislators, however, felt obligated not to change the substance of voter-approved Measure 47. A majority of legislators voted to refer Measure 50 to voters with the “double majority” language intact.

During the same 1997 session, Senator Randy Miller (R-Lake Oswego) sponsored SJR 27—legislation to refer a measure to the voters specifically targeted to eliminate the “double majority” requirement. Senator Miller told your committee that, while he is not an advocate of increased taxes, he and others like himself are philosophically opposed to a mechanism that encourages a voter strategy of staying home and not voting in order to prevent a measure from reaching the

required 50 percent turnout. Senator Miller stated that some supporters of SJR 27 were motivated by their desire to ease restrictions on the ability of local government to obtain approval of new tax or spending measures. Others like himself, were motivated by their desire to "establish a fair election process" in which votes are decided by simple majority, without exception. A majority of legislators approved the referral of SJR 27 to voters on the May 1998 ballot.

Supermajority Models from Other States

While your committee was unable to find any government in the nation that bases passage of ballot measures on the number of people registered to vote, we did identify some jurisdictions that have instituted variations of supermajority requirements. These variations include:

- a requirement that a measure be approved by more than a simple majority of those voting on the measure (e.g. 60 percent or 66 percent), and/or
- a requirement for a certain level of voter participation in the election, based on turnout at a recent major election (e.g., Washington State requires a voter turnout of at least 40 percent of the turnout at the most recent gubernatorial election to pass a school levy).

Under both of these types of requirements, there is no ambiguity about the number of votes required to pass a measure, and election officials can announce the results of the election promptly after the votes are counted.

Obstacles to Determining the Number of Eligible Voters

County clerks are responsible for maintaining voter registration records. Under past election rules, county clerks simply counted the ballots cast during an election and reported the resulting totals. Under the "double majority" rule, county clerks must also identify the number of eligible voters as of 8:00 p.m. on election day for all elections except the general election in even-numbered years. This requirement represents a significant expansion of the clerks' duties.

County clerks who spoke with the committee reported the following problems:

- it is difficult, in many cases, to determine which registered voters may not be eligible to vote;
- despite the fact that voters are required to contact the county clerk and remove themselves from the voter roles when they move or become ineligible, few do so;
- no requirement exists that a county clerk be notified of the death of someone registered to vote in that county; and
- county clerks in many cases do not have the resources to track down all registered voters whose eligibility is in question.

The definition of who is eligible to vote in any election is complicated. Eligibility

is not necessarily tied to residence at a particular address in a voting district. Persons who were registered to vote but who have left the district, are still eligible to vote in that district if they “intend” to return at some time in the future. Common examples of this situation are college students, people in the military, people on temporary assignment in other communities or out of state, national politicians, people serving in the Peace Corps, and people with vacation homes. Even if someone else has moved into the original residence and has registered to vote using that same address, the original occupants can be still eligible to vote using that address if they have the intent to return. County clerks report that tracking down people who are no longer in the community and determining each individual’s “intent” to return can be a difficult if not impossible task in many instances.

Moreover, ability of the county clerks to purge individuals no longer eligible to vote from the voter rolls is further limited by Federal laws that do not allow voters to be purged until they have not voted in two consecutive Federal elections.

Statistics

Since the passage of Measure 47, the “double majority” requirement has caused some local property tax measures to fail even though they were approved by a majority of voters. The extent to which the “double majority” requirement will impede the approval of future local tax measures is unclear.

Charles Stern, Yamhill County Clerk, compiled the results and voter turnout percentages for three local tax levy elections in 1996—before the institution of the “double majority” requirement—and for the four elections in 1997 when the requirement did apply. Of 79 measures that voters approved by a simple majority in 1996, 39 (49 percent) would have been rejected if the “double majority” requirement had been in effect. In 1997, of 73 measures that passed by a simple majority, 26 (36 percent) were rejected because voter turnout was less than 50 percent.

In mid-April 1998, the *Oregonian* reported that 68 local tax measures would be on the May 1998 election ballot. If voters approve Measure 53 in that election, these measures will not be required to meet the “double majority” standard.

Local Tax Districts Challenge Election Results

Three recent court cases illustrate the ongoing high level of confusion and conflict over the definition of voter eligibility and the process by which to determine an accurate count of eligible voters under the “double majority” requirement. In each case, a local government tax measure was approved by a majority of local voters who voted but failed to meet the 50-percent turnout requirement. The local governments then challenged the count of eligible voters

provided by the county clerks. The contested elections include:

- North Clackamas School District School Construction Bond Measure 3-89 (March 11, 1997 election)
- City of Troutdale Sewer Bond Measure 26-56 (May 20, 1997 election)
- Oregon City School District School Construction Bond Measure 3-95 (May 20, 1997 election)

In each case, local government representatives claimed that if ineligible voters had not been counted toward the total number of eligible voters, the measures would have achieved the required 50-percent turnout. The three districts raised the issue with legislators during the 1997 legislative session. Legislators, preoccupied with the task of correcting the broader problems in Measure 47, chose not to change the "double majority" requirement. They did, however, pass legislation that allows local taxing districts to challenge a county clerk's count of registered voters for a particular election.

Supporters of each of the failed tax measures mounted efforts to identify ineligible voters. For example, North Clackamas School District was 2,182 people short of achieving a 50-percent voter turnout. In response, canvassers spent a couple of months, knocking on 18,000 doors, to gather information on voters and determine whether they were eligible to vote in the election. In all three cases, the local government identified a variety of people they believed were not eligible to vote, including many people who no longer lived at the address at which they were registered to vote. The courts found that some of these people were indeed not eligible, but many others still meet the technical voter registration requirements because they had the "intent" to return to the community at some time.

Neither the City of Troutdale nor North Clackamas School District was able to convince the courts that enough voters had been ineligible to reach the 50-percent turnout mark. Your committee was not able to determine whether the local governments will appeal these decisions. The Oregon City School District case will go to trial in May 1998.

Even though a year has passed since the contested elections, no final resolution has been reached on whether the measures passed or failed, and the status of the projects the measures were intended to fund is equally uncertain. Elections officials admit that confusion and disagreement persist over when and how local governments can challenge counts of eligible voters, and what standards should be used to determine a voter's eligibility. They suggest that additional legislation may be needed to clarify these issues.

III. ARGUMENTS PRO AND CON

A. Arguments Advanced in Favor of the Measure

- Now that property tax Measure 47 has taken effect, even some backers of that measure admit the little-noticed “double majority” provision is flawed. By requiring that non-voters be counted as “no” votes in local special elections, out-of-date voter records mean people who have moved or are dead can determine the outcome of special local elections.
- Even people who can't vote because of illness or family crisis or those who don't bother to vote are counted as “no” votes. This goes against a basic principle of democracy; the majority of people voting should decide elections.
- It isn't possible to correct this flaw by keeping voter records current because of Oregon's open voter registration process and the federal “motor voter” laws.
- In the March 1997 elections, the majority of voters favored passage of at least 12 local levies and bonds, but those measures were all defeated because voter turnout was less than fifty percent. In those cases, voters' rights were denied.
- In 1996, Oregon voters made their opinion on the issue of “double majority” very clear when 88 percent voted against the concept in Measure 46.
- Measure 53 is necessary to restore full democracy to our election process.

B. Arguments Advanced Against the Measure

- Taxes are a burden to the public. It is important that limits be placed upon government, especially its taxation practices.
- Passage of Measure 53 would cost Oregon taxpayers millions of dollars in higher property taxes.
- The double majority rule ensures that tax proponents must make a strong case to gain passage of new tax measures. If most citizens care about the budget issues they will make the effort to vote; if not, a minority of tax advocates will prevail over the wishes of the majority of the public.

- The double majority ensures tax increases are only on the ballot when people are paying attention—at the general election. It ends the common practice of local governments in which they sneak by tax increases by placing them on the ballot only at special elections with low voter turn-outs of 15 to 30 percent—thereby cynically subverting the will of the majority.
- The double majority allows votes on tax increases at any election to meet emergency needs, provided voters are informed and convinced enough of the legitimacy of the need to come out and vote. If the government seeking the tax increase can make its case to the voters that the funding must be forthcoming now, and that it cannot wait until the general election, then the funding may be obtained by voter approval.
- The double majority rule was approved by the residents of the state when they passed 1996 Measure 47. Now the legislature has referred the question back to the voters, who have already indicated their support of the concept. This is wasteful and suggests that the legislature lacks confidence in and respect for the democratic process.
- The risk of voters refusing to vote in order to cast a double “no” vote is small because by so doing, voters eliminate their ability to vote on other issues and candidates at the same election.
- Taxing districts use public money through “informational mailings” and “public relations” to encourage voters to pass tax measures. This inappropriate use of public funds gives tax proponents an unfair advantage and undermines the democratic process.

IV. DISCUSSION

Your committee has chosen to focus its analysis on what it believes are the two most important issue areas: general democratic principles, and technical issues related to the implementation of the “double majority” requirement.

Is the “double majority” requirement consistent with Democratic Principles?

Measure 53 places before the voters of Oregon a fundamental question about the nature of participatory democracy: shall questions of public policy be decided by voters who care enough to go to the polls, or should they be decided by voters who choose not to vote? Indeed, the question is not even that simple, for the fact is that under the system put in place by Measure 47 and retained by Measure 50, persons who do not vote can have a greater impact on the outcome

of an election than persons who do vote.

The "double majority" standard is a significant departure from Oregon's long-standing tradition of deciding issues on the ballot by a simply majority of those who participate in an election. Proponents of the present 50-percent turnout requirement profess to be concerned about the possibility that small groups of voters, well-organized around a particular cause, had the power, before Measures 47 and 50 were adopted, to approve property tax measures at "stealth" elections, held at odd times of the year, with very low voter turnout. They believe that voters will choose not to vote in these elections, for lack of time, interest, or familiarity with a proposed tax measure and will thereby leave the majority of the registered voters—and their pocketbooks—to be dominated by a minority of active tax proposal supporters.

Some question how much protection voters need from local tax proposals and special elections. The legislature, over past decades, has steadily reduced the number of possible elections at which local governments can place tax measures before voters. Voters, who in the past may have had difficulty reaching the polls, now have their ballots mailed to their homes along with the Voters' Pamphlet. Voters continue to have the ability to simply vote "no" on any local tax measure with which they are uncomfortable or that do not fully understand.

The "stealth election" arguments used to support the "double majority" requirement are particularly ironic in light of the fact that the 50-percent turnout requirement was itself a "stealth" provision, in that it was buried deep in Measures 47 and 50, both of which were presented to the voters as property tax limitation measures, not as electoral reform measures. The fact that voters approved Measures 47 and 50 is not an accurate indication of the voters' true feelings about a double-majority requirement or about their support for other mechanisms to raise the hurdle for passage of tax measures. When the voters were presented with the opportunity to vote up or down on Measure 46, a proposal to require approval from 50-percent of registered voters to pass local tax measures, they soundly rejected it.

While some anti-tax activists would like to see even fewer opportunities for local governments to raise taxes, other citizens feel strongly that local governments need to have adequate opportunities to go to their citizens and ask for funds to support legitimate public projects and services. Many other citizens believe voters have a simple responsibility to cast a ballot either in favor or against such measures, and that an individual's choice not to vote should not be given greater value than the active choice to cast a ballot.

The disproportionate power of non-participants under the "double majority" requirement is vividly illustrated by the facts of the 1997 North Clackamas School District election. The District has approximately 54,000 registered voters, and 22,732 of them turned out to vote in the November election. They approved

the District's tax proposal by a margin of 13,603 to 9,933. Because of the 50-percent turnout requirement, the proposal was defeated. If approximately 2,182 more voters had voted, and thus brought the turnout to the 50-percent requirement, and if all of them had voted against the measure, the measure would have been approved by a margin of about 13,600 to 12,100. Thus, people who oppose a tax measure are more effective in defeating it by not voting at all than by voting against it.

Under our current state tax system, local jurisdictions and special service districts, including schools, depend heavily on property tax revenue. Many communities are experiencing rapid population growth, and local governments are under pressure to plan for and accommodate rapidly shifting and expanding public needs—sewers and schools being only a couple examples. Many proponents of Measure 53 feel that the current “double majority” requirement places an undue burden on the ability of local governments to assess, forecast, and respond to these local needs, and the ability of communities to take actions critical to the fabric and quality of their citizen's lives. “Double majority” supporters respond that local governments should try harder to generate support for local tax measures or should wait under the general election every two years.

Technical Implementation Problems with the “Double Majority”

While much of the campaign for Measure 53 is focused on the issue of democratic principles, less attention is being paid to the significant technical problems with implementation of the “double majority” requirement.

The key technical problem is basing the “double majority” on the number of registered voters, rather than on a hard number like a certain percentage of the vote in an election or a turnout requirement based on the number of voters in a recent election. (Oregon uses the number of voters in the most recent gubernatorial election to establish the number of signatures required to qualify a measure for the ballot.)

Traditionally, county clerks and elections officials have dealt with voters who come forward to cast a ballot. Under the “double majority” requirement, county clerks are obliged to track down information on potentially hundreds of people with whom they have no contact otherwise. Federal laws further complicate the ability of county clerks to keep their voter rolls current by limiting how soon someone can be purged from the rolls.

Proponents of Measure 53 and elections officials strongly maintain that the “double majority” reduces the timeliness and certainty with which the outcome of an election can be reported. After an election, the electorate should know whether or not a measure has passed or failed. In the past, this was not a problem. Under the “double majority” it can be a significant problem, as

evidenced by conflicts over the voter counts in the North Clackamas and Oregon City School Districts and the City of Troutdale's bond measures. A year after the elections, voters in those jurisdictions still are not sure whether the measures passed or failed. Such delays increase construction costs, delay the completion of needed facilities and can adversely impact on a jurisdiction's bond rating and resultant bond costs.

Other states and local jurisdictions that have chosen to raise the bar for passage of tax measures beyond a simple majority have not chosen Oregon's approach.

V. CONCLUSIONS

1. The "double majority" requirement puts undue influence in the hands of those who do not participate in an election. Your committee believes that this runs counter to democratic principles. Our electoral system should not reward voters for staying at home and not voting.
2. The current "double majority" rule requires county clerks to come up with a credible count of eligible voters for each non-general election—a task that is difficult at best and often impossible to achieve in a timely and accurate manner. Voters deserve certainty and timeliness in election results.
3. The "double majority" requirement creates a new and complex role for county clerks that many do not have the personnel or resources to adequately carry out.
4. The uncertainties and delays that can result from the "double majority" requirement impede the ability of local government to plan and budget effectively.
5. The "double majority" requirement puts undue limits on the ability of local tax districts to raise revenues needed to meet legitimate and growing public needs.
6. Even people who are opposed to higher taxes and supportive of making it more difficult to raise taxes should be concerned about the lack of certainty and technical problems that arise from Oregon's current "double majority" mechanism.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Your Committee unanimously recommends a YES vote on Measure 53.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeannette Fruen

Paul Millius

Roger F. Smith

Charles Hinkle, chair

Tomm Pickles, Research Advisor

Paul Leistner, Research Director

The committee members thank City Club Member *John Leeper* for his contributions to this report.

VI. APPENDICES

WITNESS LIST

Scott Ballo, "Yes on Measure 53" campaign
Ron Boutin, attorney, North Clackamas School District
Tom Brian, Oregon state representative
Gene Derfler, Oregon state senator
Vicki Ervin, director, Elections Division, Multnomah County
John Kauffman, clerk, Clackamas County
Phil Keisling, Oregon secretary of state
Paula Krane, president, League of Women Voters of Oregon
James Moore, University of Portland
Becky Miller, Oregon Taxpayers United
Randy Miller, Oregon state senator
Fred Neal, Office of the Secretary of State, State of Oregon
John Pearson, Office of the Secretary of State, State of Washington
Doug Peterson, National League of Cities
Mandy Rafool, National Conference of State Legislatures
Colleen Sealock, director, Elections Division, Oregon Secretary of State
Charles Stern, clerk, Yamhill County

RESOURCE MATERIALS

City Club reports and resolutions printed in the *Bulletin*:

- *Oregon Ballot Measure 25: 60 Percent Legislative Vote Required to Pass Revenue Bills*. Vol. 77, No. 48, May 10, 1996.
- *Oregon State Ballot Measure 30: Unfunded State Mandates to Local Governments*. Vol. 78, No. 18, October 11, 1996.
- general membership resolution: *State of Oregon Ballot Measure 46—Majority of Registered Voters Required to Approve Taxes*. Vol. 78, No. 16, September 27, 1996.
- *Oregon State Ballot Measure 47: Property Tax "Cut" and "Cap."* Vol. 78, No. 19, October 18, 1996.
- *Oregon State Ballot Measure 50: Legislative Rewrite of 1996 Ballot*

Measure 47. Vol. 78, No. 47, May 2, 1997.

Frey, Robert. Oregon Department of Revenue. List and count of types of Oregon local taxing districts, April 27, 1998.

Materials from Yes on 53 campaign

memo. From: Charles Stern, Yamhill County Clerk; To: Interested Parties; RE: Levy Elections, February 26, 1998 (includes tables of 1996 and 1997 election results)

Miller, Becky. List of reasons to oppose Measure 53, April 16, 1998.

Oregon Voters' Pamphlet, November 1998. "Measure 53," "In favor" and "Opposed" statements.

Text of Oregon Ballot Measures 47, 50, 46, 53.