

STATE MEASURES	EXPLANATION
#1	The measure would amend the constitution to require the Legislature to adequately fund school quality goals linked to Oregon's school reform efforts. If funding isn't adequate, the legislature must issue a report analyzing why funding fell short and how that will affect students. Also, the measure would require the state to establish grants for poor school districts. Supporters say that the measure would hold the legislature accountable for school funding and help poor districts that would otherwise lack the funding needed to meet school reform benchmarks. Opponents say either the measure doesn't go far enough to ensure funding or goes too far and binds the legislature to fund schools based on questionable cost estimates.
#2	The measure would amend the constitution to create a process for petitioners to require the legislature to review government agency policies. Those in favor of the measure say that it will create citizen-driven accountability. Those in opposition say the measure would upset the state's balance of powers, which already allows for legislative review of agencies.
#3	The measure requires conviction before property forfeiture, restricts use of proceeds, requires reporting of the nature and disposition of all forfeited properties by forfeiting agencies and declares a penalty for violations. Supporters of the measure say that it reestablishes the doctrine of innocent until proven guilty because no one should lose his or her property to the government unless first convicted of a crime. Opponents of the measure say that it takes a valuable law-enforcement tool away from the state. They say forfeiture is necessary for combating drug use and drunk driving. They also say it would harm animals because it fails to distinguish animals from other types of property, allowing abused animals to remain in the hands of their abusers.
#4	The measure creates a tobacco settlement trust fund with earnings dedicated to low-income health care. Supporters of the measure say it will ensure continuation of the Children's Health Insurance Program and makes the best use of state tobacco settlement revenues. Arguments in opposition say tobacco settlement dollars should be spent on tobacco prevention programs.
#5	The measure would require mental health and criminal background checks for anybody buying a gun at a gun show. Those in favor say the measure would help law enforcement, protect Oregon gun owners and close the gun-show loophole, which allows criminals, juveniles and the criminally insane to buy guns without a background check. Those in opposition say that the measure would not reduce crime or violence but would create a hurdle for law-abiding Oregonians and invade their privacy by asking for personal information during gun-sale checks.
#6	The measure provides limited public funding to candidates accepting limits on spending and private contributions. Those in favor say the measure will give Oregon the opportunity to lead the nation in campaign finance reform and will bring fairness and accountability back to the political process. Those in opposition say politicians don't need the money and that the measure binds future legislatures to fund the campaigns of multitudes of candidates. Opponents also say that public funding would force taxpayers to support even the candidates they wouldn't vote for.
#7	The measure would require state and local governments to pay property owners if law or regulation reduces property value. Those in favor of the measure say it would protect farms, create a balance between the economy and environment and guarantee that landowners are paid fairly for their land. Those in opposition say the measure would unnecessarily cost the state billions of dollars, discourage environmental protection and give a windfall to corporations and developers.
#8	The measure limits state spending to 15 percent of the state's personal income in the prior biennium. This will reduce state government spending by an estimated \$5.7 billion for the 2001-2003 biennium. Those in favor say the measure would not require budget cuts but would limit spending by eliminating waste and creating competition among government agencies to prove their cost-effectiveness. Those in opposition say the cut will drastically affect services including education, health care, public safety, services to seniors and disabled people and protection of natural resources. Also, opponents say the measure would force Oregon to lose billions of dollars in federal funds.
#9	The measure prohibits public schools from encouraging or sanctioning homosexuality. Those schools that are found to have encouraged, sanctioned or promoted homosexuality would lose state funding. Supporters of the measure say homosexuality is wrong and should not be encouraged in schools. They also say that schools should provide information about how a gay person could become straight. Opponents say that there is no curriculum in Oregon public schools which encourages or promotes homosexuality or bisexuality. Also, they say the measure would cut health education, counseling and support programs for teens. Opponents worry that teen suicide would become more common if these services were made unavailable.
#83	Oregon's Veterans' Home Loan program provides home loans to veterans who served at least 210 days in the military prior to 1977 and filed for a loan prior to 1986. The measure would eliminate the 1986 deadline and extend the loan program to veterans who served at least 210 days after 1977. Supporters say the measure would offer loans to deserving veterans, incur no cost to the state, boost home ownership and support communities and schools via property taxes. No organized opposition.
#84	The measure would retain requirements that the state pay local governments for the costs of state-mandated programs. If the measure fails to pass, the requirement would be repealed, forcing local governments to pay for state-mandated programs. Supporters say that if the measure fails, the legislature would have no restrictions on imposing new, unfunded service requirements on local governments, which would require taxpayers to pay for the unfunded mandates. Opponents say the measure would make it difficult to set new policies in the state and would bind state efforts to preserve the state's environment.
#85	The measure would modify population and minimum area requirements for forming new counties. The measure permits new counties to be established with less than 400 square miles provided that the new county has 100,000 inhabitants. Supporters say that the measure updates the current manner of establishing counties, which has not been changed since Oregon's original constitution in 1857. The measure protects existing counties while giving citizens the right of self-determination. No organized opposition.
#86	Current statutory law requires the state to send refunds to taxpayers every two years when state income exceeds projections by 2 percent. The legislature could withhold the refund with a three-fifths vote. This measure would make this requirement a constitutional amendment and require a two-thirds vote by the legislature to withhold a refund. Supporters say the measure would ensure voters get deserved tax refunds and that the state doesn't spend money that belongs to taxpayers. Opponents say the measure would strip the legislature of its power to reserve excess funds for emergencies and would unnecessarily clutter the constitution.

STATE MEASURES	EXPLANATION
#87	The measure would allow city and county government to zone where sexually oriented businesses can locate. Supporters say that under current Oregon law, nude dancing establishments and adult bookstores are able to locate in neighborhoods and next to schools and parks. Oregon is one of only two states in the nation that prohibits cities and counties from zoning sexually oriented businesses. Opposition say the measure would give local governments too much power and weakens the Oregon Bill of Rights, taking away freedom of expression.
#88	The measure would cut taxes by increasing the maximum deductible on Oregon personal income tax returns for federal income taxes paid from \$3,000 to \$5,000. Supporters argue the measure would reduce the amount Oregonians pay in state income taxes without harming schools, public safety or other government services. Those opposed argue the measure would reduce funding for schools and universities, which could lead to an increase in tuition.
#89	The measure would create a fund from tobacco settlement proceeds dedicated to specified health, housing and transportation programs. Supporters say Oregon will receive approximately \$2.2 billion over the next 25 years from tobacco settlements and guarantees funds will be dedicated to providing financial resources for specific health-care programs, as well as assisting the elderly and disabled members of the community. Opponents say that tobacco settlement money should be used to make a real commitment to tobacco prevention.
#90	This measure would allow regulated utilities — including electric, phone, gas and water — to charge rates high enough to make closed facilities profitable. Supporters say the measure would unburden utilities and, over time, save consumers money. Opponents say the measure would unfairly hike utility rates to bail out utility blunders.
#91	The measure would make federal income taxes fully deductible on Oregon personal and corporate income tax returns. Supporters say the measure will end double taxation and control state spending. Opponents say a person must make \$81,000 to benefit from the measure and that it will reduce the state budget by at least a \$1 billion each year. This could result in a funding decrease for education by 10 percent of its current budget and hurt public services such as fire, emergency services and libraries.
#92	Measure 92 would prohibit payroll deductions for political purposes without specific written authorization from the employee each year. It would also restrict the use of payroll-deducted funds from such organizations as unions, charities, insurance companies and financial institutions. Supporters argue Measure 92 would not prevent employees from contributing to any political cause they wish; it would only require organizations to get annual written permission from the employee. Those opposed argue Measure 92 restricts the political voice of union employees and would harm such organizations as charities and student groups, which receive money from deductions.
#93	This measure would require Oregonians to vote on increases in taxes or fees. If the measure passes, future tax or fee increases would have to pass by whatever margin Measure 93 passes. Levies passed since 1998 would be called to vote as well. Supporters say the measure would give voters more control over their tax dollars and halt runaway government spending. Opponents say that voters would be overwhelmed with countless tax levies and that voters would vote "no" on vital tax and fee increases.
#94	The measure repeals Measure 11 — mandatory minimum sentences for certain violent and other felonies — and requires resentencing. Supporters say the measure would allow judges to determine the length of a sentence, minimizing tough sentences on young, first-time offenders. Opponents say violent juveniles should be sentenced as adults, and that criminals committing crimes such as rape, murder and assault should not be given minimum sentences.
#95	The measure would link teacher pay with student performances on assessment tests. Supporters say the measure would improve public education by discouraging pay based on seniority, requiring teachers to meet standards and encouraging teachers to seek ongoing training. Opponents say the measure would unjustly threaten jobs and create competition between teachers. They also argue that no student exam would sufficiently assess student performance.
#96	This measure would bar the legislature from altering the initiative process to make it more difficult for an initiative to reach the ballot. Supporters say the measure would protect the initiative process from being restricted. Opponents say the measure would unnecessarily restrain legislators from fine tuning the process.
#97	This measure would prohibit the use of animal traps, including steel-jawed leghold traps, and would outlaw the harvest and sale of fur using such traps. It would also make the use of poisons sodium fluoroacetate and sodium cyanide illegal. Proponents say the measure will put an end to the use of needlessly cruel traps that indiscriminately trap animals. Opponents say the measure would take a vital element of the agricultural business out of the hands of farmers and ranchers.
#98	The measure would prohibit the use of public resources — including public monies, public employee time, public buildings, and public equipment and supplies — to collect or help collect political funds. Political funds include money contributed to candidates, political committees or parties and ballot measure or initiative petitions. Supporters say the measure would give back public workers' rights and make sure that every political contribution a public employee makes to his or her union will be freely given. Opponents say the measure would take away a worker's right to choose whether or not to participate in political funding and would negatively impact students.
#99	The measure would amend the constitution to create a state commission that would work to ensure high-quality home care for elderly and disabled people who receive publicly funded personal care in their homes. Supporters say the measure would improve in-home care for elderly and disabled people. They argue that in-home care is less costly and more humane than institutional care. No organized opposition.