



**Lincoln County
Voters' Pamphlet
Special Election
November 2, 2021**



This Voters' Pamphlet is provided to give you, the voter, additional information on candidates and measures. You will not vote on every office in this pamphlet. Your ballot will contain only those issues for which you are eligible to vote - based on where you live. Each candidate had the opportunity to submit a picture and statement regarding his/her candidacy. If you have any questions, please call our office at (541) 265-4131. Also visit our website: www.co.lincoln.or.us/clerk/
“Customer Service is our #1 Priority!”

Dana W Jenkins, Lincoln County Clerk

Ballot Drop Site Locations

You may mail in your ballot or deposit it at any of the drop sites listed below:

LINCOLN COUNTY COURTHOUSE

225 W Olive, Room 201; Newport
INSIDE BOX: 8am to 5pm M-F
 (September 23rd through November 1st)
 November 2nd ONLY (Election Day) 7am-8pm
OUTSIDE BOX: Drive-up ballot box in rear parking lot—open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week until 8pm on November 2nd (beginning September 23rd)

LINCOLN CITY CITY HALL

801 SW Hwy 101; Lincoln City
OUTSIDE BOX: Drive-up ballot box in lower parking lot—open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week until 8pm on November 2nd (beginning September 23rd)

DEPOE BAY CITY HALL

570 SE Shell; Depoe Bay
OUTSIDE BOX: Drive-up ballot box in City Hall parking lot—open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week until 8pm on November 2nd (beginning September 23rd)

NEWPORT CITY HALL

169 SW Coast Hwy; Newport
INSIDE BOX: 8am to 5pm M-Th
 (September 23rd through November 1st)
 November 2nd ONLY (Election Day) 8am-8pm
OUTSIDE BOX: Use Drive-up water payment (and ballot) box - turn just north of the bus stop in front of Newport City Hall—open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week until 8pm on November 2nd (beginning September 23rd)

TOLEDO POLICE STATION

250 W Hwy 20, Toledo
OUTSIDE BOX: Drive-up ballot box in Toledo Police Station Parking lot – open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week until 8pm on November 2nd (beginning September 23rd)

SILETZ CITY HALL

215 W Buford; Siletz
OUTSIDE BOX: Drive-up ballot box in City Hall parking lot—open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week until 8pm on November 2nd (beginning September 23rd)

WALDPORT CITY HALL (new location)

355 Alder Street; Waldport
INSIDE BOX:
 8:30am to 4:30pm M-F
 (September 23rd through November 1st)
 November 2nd ONLY (Election Day) 8am-8pm
OUTSIDE BOX: Drive-up ballot box in City Hall drive-through lane – open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week until 8pm on November 2nd (beginning September 23rd)

YACHATS CITY HALL

276 W 6th Street; Yachats
OUTSIDE BOX: Drive-up ballot box in City Hall drive-through lane—open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week until 8pm on November 2nd (beginning September 23rd)

EDDYVILLE COMMUNITY CHURCH

INSIDE BOX:
 6890 Crystal Creek Loop, Eddyville
 November 2nd ONLY (Election Day) 10am-8pm

Your ballot must be received at a designated drop site (including the Courthouse) by 8:00pm on November 2nd.

You may mail it in or take it to a drop site any day before that also.

Latest day to place in the U.S. Mail is October 26th. (Postmarks do not count.)

Latest time to place in a drop site is 8:00pm on November 2nd.

NO POSTAGE REQUIRED IN THE MAIL OR AT DROPSITES!

Measure 21-203 (Proposed by Initiative Petition) Lincoln County

Ballot Title

21-203

Altering short term rental dwelling licensing in unincorporated Lincoln County

QUESTION: Shall Lincoln County prohibit new, and phase out existing STR licenses in certain residential zones, and adopt new STR restrictions?

SUMMARY: This Measure would amend Chapter 4 of the Lincoln County Code regarding short term rentals of dwelling units (STRs). It would apply only in the unincorporated areas of Lincoln County. New STR licenses would not be issued in residential neighborhoods zoned R-1-A, R-1 and R-2. STRs in those zones would become "non-conforming uses" of real property, would be limited to owners of record at the time the use became non-conforming, would not be transferable to new owners and would be phased out within 5 years, with some hardship exemptions available. A process is provided wherein R-1-A, R-1 and R-2 subdivisions may be down-zoned to allow for STRs. Persons would be limited to having only one ownership interest in a STR within the R-1-A, R-1 and R-2 zones. This Measure would decrease the basic maximum number of persons per sleeping area from 3 per sleeping area plus an additional 2 persons, to 2 persons per sleeping area. Overall, STR occupancy would be based upon the number of bedrooms, parking spaces, and septic system capacity.

unless hardship relief is granted in accordance with the Measure.

- The Measure provides for an exception process for accessory dwelling units licensed and operating as an STR on the date of adoption of the Measure, where the primary residence is not licensed or operated as an STR on the date of adoption of the Measure.
- Effective upon adoption of the Measure, a person having an STR license shall not be able to hold a STR license for any other property in Lincoln County.
- STR licenses shall not transfer with the sale or conveyance of the property.
- The Measure provides a process wherein STRs could be allowed if the neighborhood is down-zoned.

Other provisions of the Measure apply to all STRs (regardless of what zone they are in) within Lincoln County:

- New occupancy limits are set.
- The maximum occupancy shall be reduced from three per sleeping area plus an additional two persons, to two persons over the age of two years old per sleeping area.
- For parking, one outside off-street parking space per bedroom is required plus one additional space per unit.
- Additional requirements for septic inspections are outlined. The occupancy must be supported by septic system capacity as determined by the County.

(This information submitted by Lincoln County as required by law)

Explanatory Statement

Enactment of this Measure would amend Chapter 4 of the Lincoln County Code regarding short term rentals of dwelling units (STRs). "Short term rentals" means the renting of a dwelling unit (including an accessory dwelling unit on the same property) for a period of up to 30 consecutive nights. Long term rentals, those which are month to month or longer, are not regulated by Chapter 4 or this Measure. Also, this Measure provides that "hosted homeshares", where the homeowner is present (staying overnight) during the transient rental, are not regulated. This Measure applies only in the unincorporated areas of Lincoln County and not within the cities in the County.

Many of the provisions of this Measure would only apply to residential neighborhoods zoned R-1-A, R-1 and R-2. The Measure would prohibit, modify or restrict STR uses in these zones in the following ways:

- Effective the date of the adoption of the Measure, no new STR licenses shall be issued.
- STR licenses that are allowed to lapse shall not be renewed, and no new license shall be issued for the property.
- STR licenses that are not used for a consecutive period of one year and one day, shall expire and shall not be renewed, and no new license shall issue for the property.
- Effective the date of the adoption of the Measure, existing STR uses would become non-conforming. They would not be assignable or transferable and would cease when ownership is transferred.
- Licenses for non-conforming uses of dwellings for STRs would be amortized within a 5 year period from the date of the adoption of the Measure. At the end of the amortization period, STR usage of the non-conforming use would expire,

Measure 21-203 Arguments

Argument in Favor

RESTORE HOUSING & PROTECT RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS

Vote YES on Measure 21-203 to restore and preserve the character and livability of low-density residential neighborhoods in unincorporated Lincoln County.

Lincoln City, Newport, Depoe Bay and Yachats all limit locations and numbers of vacation Short Term Rentals (STRs). Lincoln County failed to do either. Any house in unincorporated Lincoln County can be an STR under current rules. STRs are commercial lodging businesses, like unsupervised mini-hotels. Hundreds of them have invaded formerly quiet low-density residential neighborhoods. Three-bedroom houses are licensed for 11 renters. Some neighborhoods are more than 40% STRs. Imagine the impact on full-time residents.

STRs have a place in Lincoln County in tourist-commercial zones with tourist amenities like restaurants. **But hundreds of STRs are inappropriately located** in single-family residential zones R-1, R-1-A, and R-2. Nearly 70% are not on public sewers. They use individual septic systems not designed for such high occupancies.

Measure 21-203 will protect low-density residential zones by (1) halting new licensing, (2) immediately reducing occupancies, (3) a five-year phase-out of existing STRs, and (4) closing serious loopholes in septic system regulations.

Measure 21-203 will help restore Lincoln County's long-term housing stock by discouraging outside speculators from buying up houses for STR purposes.

The STR industry claims grossly exaggerated economic benefits for the county, but they use inflated estimates and assumptions, not local data. Most rent money from STRs does not even pass through Lincoln County. It goes directly to non-resident owners and non-local booking companies. For an excellent, independent analysis of the negative consequences of STRs, see <https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/assets/asset85067.aspx>. It applies to Lincoln County, not just Arizona.

By halting new licensing and phasing out existing STRs from single-family neighborhoods, Measure 21-203 will restore and preserve these neighborhoods as safe places for families to live. Phasing out STRs will eliminate churning of nightly renters through quiet neighborhoods. This will reduce nuisances, public health and safety problems, and help restore livability.

Vote YES on Measure 21-203

(This information furnished by James E Peterson, 15neighborhoods.)

Argument in Favor

Will Measure 21-203 ban all STRs?

No. That claim is false. Most STRs are in cities, from Lincoln City to Yachats. They won't be affected by this measure. Only STRs in residential neighborhoods in unincorporated Lincoln County will be phased out, and STRs are still allowed in proper zoning districts.

Are claimed economic benefits of STRs real?

Pro-STR propaganda ads claim STRs in the county provide 3600 jobs, \$192,000,000 in wages (\$53,000 per job!), \$27,000,000 spent in restaurants, \$105,000,000 on local travel, and \$11,200,000 to local governments. Nonsense. These numbers are exaggerated estimates to start with, and for the entire county to boot. Most economic benefits by far go to the cities and will be unaffected by Measure 21-203. How many people do you know in the STR industry? Can you believe 3600 housekeepers, landscapers and others working at 529 STRs? Do you know any who are making \$53,000? At \$15 per hour, every STR could have live-in help 24/7/365 and still not even come close to \$192,000,000. And \$105 million spent on travel within Lincoln County? Ridiculous.

How will the county replace lost tax revenue?

There won't be much lost revenue. Travelers will still come, and stay in motels and all the remaining STRs in the cities and in non-residential zones in the county. Lincoln County's budget shows \$1,225,000 from Tourist Lodging Taxes (TLT), about half from motels and hotels, not STRs. STRs provide roughly \$610,000, only about 5% of what the STR supporters claim.

Will property taxes go up to replace it?

No. By law, 70% of TLT goes to promoting tourism, not to county services and programs. Fire departments, schools, health programs and all of county government are funded by property taxes, paid at the same rate whether a house is an STR or not. In fact, speculators buying houses to rent as STRs have been driving up property values, and that makes your property taxes go up.

Vote YES on 21-203

(This information furnished by Robert Sulek, 15neighborhoods.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Measure 21-203 Arguments

Argument in Favor

We have a housing crisis in Lincoln County and taking houses out of the long term rental pool to make them nightly rentals for tourists is adding to the problem. Zoning did not protect our housing or our neighborhoods, but now we, the people of Lincoln County, can protect unincorporated neighborhoods and areas like Bayshore, Gleneden Beach, and many others, from being completely taken over by non-resident owners operating mini-motels. Cities have already enacted ways to combat the spread of vacation rentals, the County must do the same.

Vote yes on Measure 21-203 to protect housing. Lincoln County should not be sold off to outside speculators. Our residents need houses to live in so we can live and work in the same place. Don't let Lincoln County become like Bend and so many other places that are out of reach for regular, working families.

Everyone registered to vote in Lincoln County can vote on this measure. Let your voice be heard. Short-term rental economic benefits to Lincoln County are exaggerated, except to the people who own or manage them, and the jobs they provide are advertised all the time: housekeeping positions. Their impacts on housing availability and neighborhood livability are huge.

You are a resident of Lincoln County. More than 90% of short-term rental owners are not! Make your vote count.

Working folks need housing. Fishermen need housing, seafood processors need housing, nurses and health care workers need housing, teachers need housing, families need housing. Tourists have hotels, motels, bed and breakfasts, campgrounds and short term rentals in tourist-commercial zones. Business has no business in our single-family neighborhoods! Protect your neighborhood, protect housing, protect Lincoln County.

Vote YES on Measure 21-203!

(This information furnished by Michele Riley, Resident unincorporated Lincoln County.)

Argument in Favor

Living in Gleneden Beach, I've learned an estimated 20% of houses are licensed as Short Term Rentals (STRs). In the block going north of our house, there are 5 rentals, the block south has 4 (56%). At any one time, nearly 140 people can be renting in this 2 block area. There is 1 full time resident in these same 2 blocks. And 6 going 1 block east!

Why support Measure 21-203?

While most renters are friendly people, there are exceptions. While most are quiet and respectful, some are not. These are nuisances for sure. However the most significant impact is that the neighborhood has become a resort instead of single family homes. I want neighbors. I want people next door who share tools, stories, happy hour, pets, and family. I have that with the owners of beach homes and local full time residents. Now I find increasing numbers of out of town renters instead.

As a household of two lower middle class professional retirees, we looked for a "community" in which to live. Finding this home about 8 years ago, there were 4 STR's where now there are 9. Neighborhood houses have become businesses; big money making businesses.

Please consider voting yes along with me and here's why. Our community has dwindled. Our support systems are weakened due to loss of housing. Trades people, technicians, hospitality workers, firefighters, paramedics, teachers, nurses, clerks, scientists, professors, remote workers would be welcomed neighbors. And yes, they would be able to purchase houses. As STRs are phased out and the real estate market becomes reasonable again, increased purchase power and availability occurs.

Vote YES!

(This information furnished by Ted Brittsan.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Measure 21-203 Arguments

Argument in Favor

Lincoln County Democrats Vote Yes!

We support our local businesses, our working families, and a sustainable tourism economy, and that's why we endorse Measure 21-203.

This Measure will help restore the balance between tourism and our local communities that makes our County a great place to live, work, and recreate.

The real estate investors behind the No campaign have put out a lot of false claims, and some folks have questions about what effect this Ballot Measure will have. We want to answer some concerns we've heard:

• **Will this eliminate Short-Term Rentals (STRs) in Lincoln County?** No. Lincoln County will continue to have a thriving STR industry. This Measure only applies STRs in unincorporated areas that are not zoned or equipped for commercial activity.

• **Will this destroy our tourism economy?** No. STRs in unincorporated Lincoln County are a small slice of our tourism industry, but they can have outsized negative impacts.

• **Will this hurt working families?** We believe it will help working families and strengthen our community. Unregulated STRs are a big factor in making housing on the Coast unaffordable and unavailable, by inflating home prices and taking homes off the market. Our Hospitals, Schools, and other employers are losing employees because they can't find housing, at any price!

• **Will our County lose tax money?** VIAOregon, the industry group behind the "No" campaign, has been putting out blatant falsehoods, so let's clear up a couple things. They falsely claim that this measure would apply all STRs, when in fact it would only apply to a small number of them. VIAOregon is also lying about the economic impact of STRs. For instance, one of their ads attributes 100% of the value of all construction permits issued by the County in 2019 to STR-based tourism.

Keep Lincoln County a beautiful place to live, work, and recreate. Join us in voting Yes on Measure 21-203!

(This information furnished by Michael Gaskill, Lincoln County Democratic Central Committee.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Argument in Favor

Housing for Residents versus Housing for Tourists

Save our Unincorporated Residential Neighborhoods.

Relocate the vacation rental industry to the Tourist-Commercial Zones in Lincoln County.

If you had the opportunity to return about 529 short-term rental (STR) houses used by transient vacationers to long-term housing for residents in unincorporated Lincoln County, would you?

If you had the opportunity to remove mini-motel businesses and restore the character, safety, and stability of single-family residential neighborhoods where neighbors know each other, look out for one another, and help when needed, would you?

If Measure 21-203 passes on November 2, you will have accomplished both.

If Measure 21-203 passes, Lincoln County will be required to:

1. Immediately stop issuing business licenses for short-term (under 30 days) vacation rentals (STRs) in single-family residential neighborhoods (Residential Zones R-1, R-1-A, and R-2) in unincorporated Lincoln County.

2. Phase out all STRs from the above neighborhoods in five years.

3. Limit vacation rental ownership to one STR per person, reduce occupancy to two persons per bedroom, prohibit transfer of an STR business license to a new buyer, and close septic system loopholes.

The undersigned Endorsers of the Measure 21-203 need your help to

Reinstate by balance between tourism and communities.

Restore the Housing and Preserve the Neighborhoods in unincorporated Lincoln County.

Join us.

YES on MEASURE 21-203.

Neighborhood Supporters

Alsea Highlands: Alanna Miklic

Bayshore: Shelly Woodke

Beverly Beach: Lucy Nash

Depoe Bay: Linda Aguirre

Gleneden Beach: Ardys Schimmel

Homeless: Timothy Bisson

Little Whale Cove: Michele Walters

Miroco: Marge Hammond Farness

Newport: Rhonda Harman and Cathy Devereaux

Newport Nye Beach: Wendy Engler

Otter Rock: Beth Elliker

Pacific Shores: Bob Sulek

Roads End: Elaine Walsh and Cindy Thompson

Salishan Hills: Julia Pearson

Sandpiper: Roger and Linda Keehn

Seagrove: Judith Bowman-Kreitmeyer

Surfland: Dianne Eckstein

Tidewater: Mona Linstromberg

Toledo: Robin Wedertz

Waldport: Starla Gade

Community Group Supporters

Bayshore Accountability Neighbors Group (B.A.N.G.) Rebecca Hayden

Central Oregon Coast National Organization for Women (COO NOW) Amy Greer

(This information furnished by Lucy Nash.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Measure 21-203 Arguments

Argument in Favor

Return the balance between tourism and local communities.

Vote for 21-203 for a Livable Lincoln County.

It must be a priority to provide long-term housing to educators, nurses, firefighters, and others needed to maintain a healthy, safe, and livable community. The short-term vacation rental (STR) debate in Lincoln County is not politically partisan, it is about building thriving and sustainable communities.

Over the past year, Lincoln County voters from all parties who signed the petition for Measure 21-203, expressed concern about the impact of STRs on the Lincoln County School District. In the past few years, qualified and talented educators hired or recruited chose to leave due to lack of available housing. We need qualified educators to teach our students, these educators also bring families to the community and students to schools.

As long-term housing becomes less accessible, more and more families leave the District. This impacts the District's "federal per pupil funding" which is critical for schools to survive.

Fortunately, Lincoln County has not closed schools, yet we began the 2021-2022 school year with many vacancies. New teachers cannot find affordable housing. Existing teachers either lost their long-term rental housing as these homes became STRs or risk losing it when the temporary suspension of new licensing in unincorporated Lincoln County expires on November 30 ... unless Measure 21-203 passes.

Tourists do not need our single-family homes to enjoy the Coast, but residents need housing to keep our schools.

For these reasons, the following current and retired teachers of your Lincoln County School District support Measure 21-203.

Restore our Housing.

Preserve the Neighborhoods in unincorporated Lincoln County.

Save our schools.

Sandra Blackman

Denise Doerfler

Aracelly Guevara

Dr. Jerry Robbins

(This information furnished by Monica Kirk .)

Argument in Opposition

I am employed by Meredith Lodging, which is a local, family owned, grass roots Vacation Rental Management Company with headquarters in Lincoln City. If measure 21-203 passes the devastation would be catastrophic to thousands of locals, and hundreds of businesses. I have worked in the lodging industry in Lincoln City for close to 10 years, and if this measure passes, I would likely lose my job along with hundreds of my coworkers. There are not enough jobs on the coast for the thousands of service industry employees that this will affect, and we will be forced to seek employment in larger cities such as Salem/Portland. I have roots in this community, as do the other thousands of individuals in the service industry. I have family, friends, and relationships that have been forged over the years I would have to vacate. My family and I just purchased a home in Lincoln City and have pumped tens of thousands of dollars into the local economy hiring painters, contractors, laborers, and landscapers.

The majority of individuals in favor of this measure are not working-class citizens in the tourism industry relying on the money generated from tourists occupying these Short-Term Rentals. Many are retired and financially stable and secure. They will not be forced to face the tough decisions such as figuring out how to provide for their family, how to keep a roof over their heads and food on the table, the possibility of having to file for unemployment, or worse the possibility of having to relocate.

Please save local jobs, help keep thousands of hard-working individuals employed and their families financially stable and secure.

Vote no on Ballot Measure 21-203.

Jordan Grant

Meredith Lodging

(This information furnished by Jordan Grant, Meredith Lodging.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Measure 21-203 Arguments

Argument in Opposition

Vote NO on Ballot Measure 21-203 to eliminate Short Term Rentals (STR's) in Lincoln County.

A few property owners don't want a vacation rental in their neighborhood and are trying to eliminate many STR's. Lincoln County has strict regulations for STR's relating to licensing, quiet hours, number of persons and vehicles allowed per each property, parking, health and safety, enforcement mechanisms, and is currently considering additional regulations. County regulation of STR's is welcomed, but the complete elimination of STR's goes too far.

Proponents claim that income generated from STRs goes to out of state owners. As a lifelong Oregonian, and an owner of a family property in unincorporated Lincoln County for 55 years, that has been an STR for over 20 years, we know where our revenue goes. All revenue collected from our STR goes into paying taxes, fees, licenses, utilities and the wages of property management staff, cleaning staff, maintenance staff, landscapers, contractors, local Building suppliers and local service workers. All of our revenue stays in Lincoln County.

We get to enjoy our STR for our personal use during portions of the year. That is our reward. Our neighbors are our friends. If they had issues with our STR, we would know it, and would address it with management.

We have contractors and businesspeople rent our property for a month or two at a time while they have projects to complete in the county. Where would these people stay without STR's?

When North Lincoln County was ravaged by fire last year, many of the STR owners offered up their properties as temporary housing, free of charge, until those impacted by fire and loss could get back on their feet. I wonder how many of those that want to eliminate STR's opened their homes to these people in need?

Vote NO on 21-203. Save local jobs and tourism.

Mitchell Gensman

Homeowner

* Estimate of economic impact from Via Oregon Coalition

(This information furnished by Mitchell Gensman.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 21-203 is Short-Sighted and offers no constructive alternative to assist economic recovery for our working families.

If this measure only impacted Short-Term Rentals (STRs) it would still be a bad idea, but its consequences will be far more reckless to our larger local economy.

Measure 21-203 would create a tremendous negative financial impact on our families and friends employed in the visitor industry, as well as many other types of businesses connected to it.

This measure will measurably decrease jobs for local landscapers and construction workers building and maintaining tourism properties, local farmers and fishers supplying restaurants and food stores, and decrease demand for financial and technology jobs supporting all these businesses.

It's estimated that 4000 jobs* in the county are connected to the existence of STR's, generating \$200,000,000* in local wages. These workers in turn spend their wages locally on other non-tourism businesses coming from the new money visitors contribute.

The Pandemic has made workers from all industries suffer enough; having lost much-needed paychecks, their healthcare and other benefits. Measure 21-203 would make their lives even more difficult.

This measure is a band-aid solution for what is actually a complex and multilayered issue needing a thoughtful approach. Don't gamble on this short term experiment at the expense of long term financial security.

Vote NO on 21-203

Oregon Coast Visitors Association

* Estimate of economic impact from Via Oregon Coalition

(This information furnished by Arica Sears, Oregon Coast Visitors Association.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Measure 21-203 Arguments

Argument in Opposition

Vote NO to save small businesses and jobs

I own and operate a small business in Lincoln City. My business could not survive solely on local residents, my business could not survive solely on tourism. It takes the balance of both to help my business and many others in Lincoln County to thrive.

That's why I am opposed to Measure 21-203. This ill-conceived measure would eliminate both tourists and local residents who depend directly or indirectly on tourism dollars for their livelihoods.

If passed, Measure 21-203 would eliminate many tourist dollars from our economy and shrink the need for many service jobs. This will harm my business.

Aside from the adverse economic impacts, Measure 21-203 is just too extreme to be viable in our community. This is an overstepping of authority, and we need to send a strong message that this will not be tolerated.

I chose to make Lincoln County my home and my place of business because of my great neighbors and my ability to run a successful business thanks to the tourists who come to the coast. If Measure 21-203 passes there will be fewer tourist and fewer employed good neighbors.

Let help Lincoln County defeat this horrible measure by voting NO
Tracey Taylor, Owner
Point Break Fitness
Lincoln City, OR

(This information furnished by Tracey Taylor, Point Break Fitness.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 21-203 is not what it seems

The proponents of 21-203 suggests that the existence of Short-Term Rentals reduces available housing stock. This simply is not true.

Housing is expensive, especially at the coast. Our most critical local housing need is for lower income housing. Converting higher end expensive Short-Term Rentals to housing stock will do little to address the need for lower income housing. The county's Housing Strategy Plan emphasizes affordable housing. Land use changes that result in more affordable multi-family, manufactured, and Accessory Dwelling Unit homes, is what's needed to address the housing crisis. Can we expect the proponents of 21-203 to support this higher housing density in their neighborhood or will they attempt to prevent that also, as it dilutes their vision of a "Quiet" neighborhood?

While action needs to be taken to address our housing problems in Lincoln County, Measure 21-203 is not the solution. A broader conversation and a real effort to bring appropriate housing solutions to the county are in order.

This measure will do not address our housing issues, but it will greatly harm our thriving tourism industry.

I encourage you to vote NO on Measure 21-203

Jerome Black, Owner
Overnight Art, Lincoln City

(This information furnished by Jerome Black, Overnight Art.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Argument in Opposition

Dear Neighbors,

We know you've heard a lot of fear-based rhetoric about Short Term Rentals ruining our coastal community. The fact is that a vocal *minority* seeks to limit visitor access to the splendor of the Oregon coast at a time when local businesses are struggling to stay alive and keep workers on payroll.

If we lose Short Term Rentals, we lose year-round guests whose local spending helps us have stores, restaurants, bars, and services that we all enjoy.

Many locals first discovered our beautiful coastal community while traveling. For decades, families have sought out rental homes to gather in one place for special occasions and vacations.

If this measure passes, vacation rental guests will simply go elsewhere. So will their dollars and our jobs.

Lincoln County has NO PLAN to make up the damaging budget deficit if they are successful in driving away vital tourism that fuels our local economy.

If these crucial budget line-items disappear, the County will need to raise these funds elsewhere. Either by increasing taxes or cutting services to balance their budgets.

We know a small minority of homeowners and companies don't run a tight ship, but the answer isn't to end all Short Term Rentals, it's to enforce existing laws with meaningful consequences for bad behavior.

Defend the Rights of Property Owners who are Good Neighbors. The overwhelming majority of Short Term Rental owners are law-abiding citizens with ties to the coast. Some have a vacation home that's been in their family for decades and renting it out helps keep the home in the family.

We believe in common sense solutions.

We support Short Term Rental homeowners and companies providing additional funds to county and municipal reserves for stronger enforcement of rules and to punish bad seeds.

We urge you to Vote NO on Ballot Measure 21-203

Learn more at www.viaoregon.com

(This information furnished by Jamie Michel, VIA Oregon Coalition.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Measure 21-204 North Lincoln Fire & Rescue District

Ballot Title

21-204

North Lincoln Fire & Rescue District Local Option Levy Measure

QUESTION: Shall NLF&R levy taxes of \$1.22 per \$1,000 assessed value for five years beginning 2022-2023 for general operations?

This measure may cause property taxes to increase more than three percent.

SUMMARY: The current levy of \$0.84 expires June 2022. When this levy expires the resulting loss of 2.2 million dollars will lay off 14 firefighters, reduce volunteer programs and increase response times.

This renewal is asking for an increase of \$ 0.38 per \$1,000. For property with an assessed value of \$300,000 the proposed increase is \$114 per year or \$ 9.50 a month.

This funding will maintain the current firefighter staff of 14 and hire seven additional firefighters. Continue current Volunteer programs and strengthen Volunteer response. Purchase and maintain firefighter protective equipment. Repair and maintain District facilities, equipment, and general operations.

We have increasing call volume and decreasing Volunteer availability. This levy would maintain emergency response staff for the next 5 years ensuring that three firefighters are always on duty at the Oceanlake Fire Station covering north, three firefighters on duty at the Taft Fire Station covering south.

The proposed rate will raise an estimated \$ 3,161,283 in 2022-2023, \$ 3,240,315 in 2023-2024, \$ 3,321,323 in 2024-2025, \$3,404,356 in 2025-2026, and \$ 3,489,465 in 2026-2027.

Explanatory Statement

North Lincoln Fire & Rescue is asking District voters to renew, with an increase, a five-year local option levy to: (1) fund the current career firefighting staff of 14 and hire 7 additional firefighters. (2) continue District Volunteer programs, (3) purchase and maintain firefighter protective equipment and (4) fund general operations of the District.

What is the impact if the levy fails?

The current levy of \$0.84 expires June 2022. If this levy expires the resulting loss of 2.2 million dollars will lay off 14 Firefighters, reduce volunteer programs and increase response times. There will be less funding so facilities and safety equipment maintenance will be prioritized with some not being done at all.

The costs of providing Fire Protection are increasing faster than revenue. The Fire District is not part of, nor does it receive any funding from city, county, or state government. 97% of our funding comes from property taxes.

The proposed rate for this measure is \$1.22 per \$1,000 of assessed value. This is adding \$ 0.38 cents to the expiring levy.

Based on the best information available from the county assessor at this time, the owner of property assessed at \$300,000 would pay an estimated \$30.50 per month, or \$366 per year. This would be an increase of \$114 per year, or \$ 9.50 a month, from the current Levy.

The Fire District will use the resulting tax revenues to do the following:

- 1. Maintain the Current 14 Firefighter/EMT positions and hire 7 additional Firefighters**

The Fire District continues to see a trend of increasing call volume and decreased volunteer availability. Often several emergency calls occur at the same time. It is difficult to meet this service demand.

A combination of volunteers and career staff on shift 24 hours per day, 7 days a week at fire stations significantly reduces response times, saving lives and property.

Hiring an additional seven firefighters would ensure that three Firefighters are on duty at the Oceanlake Fire Station covering the north District and three Firefighters at the Taft Fire Station covering the south District. This staffing level of Firefighter/EMT's will be provided 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Paid firefighters do not eliminate the District's need for Volunteer Firefighters in any way. Volunteer Firefighters are an important part of the Fire District every day. This levy would enhance the overall capabilities of the District to provide service.

2. Continue Volunteer Programs

Volunteers continue to be essential to the District's emergency response. In order to recruit, encourage participation, and retain Volunteers, incentive programs have been established. This levy would allow the District to continue funding those Volunteer programs.

3. Purchase and Maintain firefighter Protective Equipment

Firefighter safety and protective equipment must be continually replaced and maintained for compliance with regulations.

4. Fund General Operations of the District

This levy would allow the District to repair and maintain facilities, equipment, fund general operations.

(This information submitted by Rob Dahlman, Fire Chief, North Lincoln Fire & Rescue District #1.)

Argument in Favor

Hello, I'm Ron Woodard II, one of your five elected board members of NLF&R District #1.

I ask for your Yes vote on our Bond Measure.

I believe that with it's approval, you will receive the best service, that your Fire District can provide.

Good, well trained people, volunteer and professional, who are supported by you, make this happen.

Our best intentions, can only do so much.

Be informed, ask us the questions you have.

We are your Fire District. Help us with your Yes vote. Volunteer as a firefighter, join the support staff, the water rescue, or the C E R T teams.

No one can do everything but each of us can do something.

Thank you, vote Yes!

(This information furnished by Ron Woodard II.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Measure 21-204 Arguments

Argument in Favor

The number of 911 calls for NLFR has nearly doubled in the last 10 years with an estimated 3,200 calls 2021. To maintain basic operations and keep up with increasing 911 calls NLFR must keep the current 14 employed, continue our volunteer programs and maintain apparatus & protective equipment. Because of increasing service demands, our volunteers agree with the plan to add 7 new firefighter/EMT's. We cannot operate without volunteers or with only paid staff, we're a family and we work hard together to keep all our families safe, 24/7. No one wants to pay a tax increase, and no one wants to ask for more, yet here we stand.

This levy replaces the current one that expires. This includes a small increase.

If we had to increase taxes on anything, wouldn't you say the people who show up after calling 911 when you're having the worst day of your life are the ones to do it for? Right now, without this small increase we all lose. Our community needs each other.

This last year alone has taken its toll on every single person in this community. When some of us lost everything, we came together for our neighbors and were overflowing with gratitude and compassion for each other. We should never lose that, help us to be able to keep helping all of you, especially when you need someone the most.

NLFR gets funding (97%) from property taxes in our district, not from any county, city, or state government. Asking for an increase in property taxes isn't ideal, but right now the cost for providing fire protection and supporting your volunteers has increased dramatically to the point we need to.

Thank You for supporting us

The Volunteers that both support and paid for this.

Lacy Ledoux
Kenny Banner
Stephanie White
Jerry Sneed
Ken Brown
Timothy Delugach
Josh Roberts

(This information furnished by Lacy LeDoux, North Lincoln Volunteer Firefighters.)

Argument in Favor

North Lincoln Professional Firefighters Local 5169 VOTE YES 21-204

It has been an honor to serve the residents of the North Lincoln Fire District through the unprecedented demand for emergency services over the past year. Through the Echo Mountain fire, COVID pandemic, and ice storm, our firefighters have worked in hazardous conditions to keep this community safe. Approval of the levy will give this community the staffing, equipment and training needed to serve the public effectively and safely.

The levy provides funds for the following needs:

- **Staffing** – Last year your firefighters answered 2,879 calls for service. Currently we are on track for 3100+. In summer months we have seen an unprecedented 20+ calls in a 24-hour period. Hiring seven additional firefighters would allow us to staff engines at North and South stations, drastically improving our response times.

- **Volunteer Programs** – Volunteers have families and careers. Responding to mid-day or night calls can be challenging. Volunteer programs incentivize current and future volunteers to give their time. Volunteers work with career staff to provide you with service you have come to expect.

- **Emergency Equipment** – Your firefighters rely on a wide range of emergency equipment to protect the public and keep our firefighters safe. Levy funds will allow the fire district to replace out-of-date equipment and protective gear.

- **Training Facilities** – Levy funds will be used to support fire district training classes to comply with training and response standards.

IF THE LEVY IS NOT APPROVED

There would be an exponential reduction in service, resulting in some calls going unanswered. Without funding, your 14 career firefighters would be laid off, and the North Lincoln Fire & Rescue would become volunteer response only. Also, a substantial loss in funding for volunteer incentive programs. Station and apparatus maintenance would be prioritized with some not being maintained at all.

North Lincoln Professional Firefighters Local 5169 ask you to please vote YES on 21-204

(This information furnished by Brian Nurdyke, North Lincoln Professional Firefighters Local 5169.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Measure 21-205 City of Newport

Ballot Title

21-205

Funding for public safety, library, parks, facilities, and other services

QUESTION: Shall the City of Newport impose a five percent tax on the sale of prepared food items and beverages?

SUMMARY: The tax will be used to support public safety, including restoring or adding three police officer positions, three firefighter/EMT positions, and a parking enforcement officer.

The tax will be used to expand library services, including the addition of a bilingual library staff person, and an additional part-time position.

The tax will be used to fund the purchase and replacement of equipment, and for roof replacement, window replacement, siding, and other infrastructure to 48 city-owned facilities, and improvements to the city's park system.

Currently, these facilities and services are primarily supported by residents and businesses located in the city, although widely used by visitors to Newport. This concept was selected because it shares the burden of financing these important local government services and facilities with visitors, and does not place the entire responsibility of financing these facilities and services on property owners and renters of the city.

The tax would terminate on July 1, 2027, unless extended by a vote of the electorate of the city.

Explanatory Statement

The City Council established Finance Work Groups over the past three years to develop a system for projecting the city's long-range financial condition (year one); identify options to address the structural deficit by looking at ways to reduce expenditures and/or increase revenues to provide financial sustainability (year two); and develop a five-year financial plan that achieves financial sustainability during this period (year three).

The Work Group reviewed estimates of future funding needed to properly maintain the 48 public structures and facilities, valued in excess of \$50 million, supported by the General Fund. These amenities, in our community of 10,000, include the PAC, VAC, Recreation Center, 60+ Center, numerous parks and trails, public restrooms, fire station, City Hall, airport, and other key infrastructure, some of which currently require significant reinvestment at this stage in order to extend their serviceable life span.

The city has a significant gap in meeting the estimated cost of replacing roofs, windows, and siding, and performing interior maintenance while funding other required operations of the city facilities. The Finance Work Group outlined steps the city might consider to increase revenues while maintaining expenses. These measures will not, alone, address the more significant financial requirements needed for the next five-year period and beyond. The Work Group concluded that the city's financial resources are currently insufficient to support both the operation of, and required reinvestment in, the above-mentioned facilities and equipment while fulfilling the General Fund's other obligations.

During the first year of collection, the prepared food and beverage tax would be used as follows:

Estimated Amount Funding Use

\$893,000 Added positions over staffing for the 2021/2022 Fiscal Year:

3 Police Officers
1 Parking Enforcement Officer

3 Firefighters/EMTs
1 Bi-lingual Librarian
0.5 Library Staff

\$400,000 Replacement and purchase of equipment

\$1,050,000 Maintenance and upgrading 48 city-owned facilities and parks with a current value of \$50 million

\$200,000 One-time business grants to assist prepared food operators for collection of this tax

Funding in future years would be used for continued support of the added positions; support for police, fire, library, and equipment purchases at a minimum of \$600,000 per year; and improvements and renovation of city facilities and parks at a minimum of \$1,050,000 per year.

The Finance Work Group acknowledged the city has significantly reduced General Fund expenditures in the last fiscal year as part of its COVID-19 budget, including a reduction of over 22 full-time-equivalent positions effective on July 1, 2020.

After reviewing opportunities to reduce expenses, the Finance Work Group focused on revenue options that would share the burden of financing important local government services and facilities between residents and non-residents who use city services. While many cities resort to special tax levies, public safety fees, and other charges on utility bills to meet financial needs, the Finance Work Group recommended the city focus on mechanisms to draw revenues not just from residents but also from visitors who use the city's infrastructure.

The full text of the measure can be obtained at city hall or at www.newportoregon.gov.

(This information submitted by Margaret M Hawker, City Recorder, City of Newport.)

Argument in Favor

Vote for the Prepared Food Tax

Newport is a town of 10,000 with the amenities of a city of 25,000. As the budget committee and the City Council has been looking at the budget for the past three years to increase the financial burden from the residents and onto the visitors here we found that under state law we can only do two things. One is to increase the hotel room taxes of that only 30% of the taxes can be used for general items such as road repair.

The second increase is to have a prepared food tax that Ashland and Yachats have. This is not a tax on restaurants but on the consumers. This will add part of the burden of the city budget onto the tourists. Only 5 states do not tax prepared foods and California and Washington charge 10% on prepared foods.

We looked at a public safety tax that Albany has but that would only be on the locals. The prepared food tax would be paid partly by the tourists.

The city budget was cut by 2.5 million dollars two years ago and 1 million this year and the future will hold additional budget reductions. Our police department has been reduced to a level they were at in 1990 and our fire crews are at a minimum and do not meet national standards. The city has already reduced the full time staff by 22 employees and more reductions will come. The budget committee and the City Council will have to make hard decisions going forward on what cuts to the Library, Rec Center, Performing Arts Center, pool and other city services if additional revenue sources can be found.

Please vote yes on the Prepared Food Tax as it will shift some of the financial burden onto the tourists. At 5% tax the average family will spend an additional \$3 per meal.

(This information furnished by Dean Sawyer.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Measure 21-205 Arguments

Argument in Favor

City provides a clear plan

The City of Newport is in need. There is a budgetary structural deficit, basically the cost of doing business is rising faster than the City's income, and it will take a bold move to fix it. That is why I am urging you to join me in voting YES for the prepared food tax measure.

The city has examined numerous other alternatives before arriving at this solution. The city already has cut 22 positions to do its part, but those cuts are not sustainable. We need police and firefighters. We need to maintain our library, various public facilities like the Visual Arts Center and our parks. The tax will generate about \$2.5 million annually to do that. It would fund the following positions and projects:

- Three police officers, one parking enforcement officer, three firefighters/EMTs, one bilingual librarian and a part-time library staff position;
- Maintenance and upgrades to 48 city-owned facilities (including the Visual Arts Center, Performing Arts Center, Recreation Center and 60+ Center) and parks;
- One-time business grants to assist prepared food vendors in collecting the new tax; and
- Replacing and purchasing equipment for city operations.

The tax would be on the rolls for five years, with an option to renew at that time. We always have an opportunity back out, but I believe this is the right way to support and maintain our public services and the special city parks and facilities that help make this community so special. If it doesn't pass, we will be hindering our police and fire service. Our parks and facilities will go on in a state of disrepair. The library will be offered for fewer hours.

(This information furnished by CM Hall.)

Argument in Favor

Local process led to local solution

We support that proposed prepared food tax because it's a solution from a thorough process that examined a variety of other alternatives. We urge you to join us in voting YES! A group of hard-working local residents decided this is the best way to have visitors and residents paying their fair share for the services that we all use.

Finance Work Group spent three years balancing revenues and cuts to reach this solution. They looked closely at a property tax levy to fund city services. They also looked at fees on utility bills.

At the end of a three-year public process, the group determined this was the best way to move forward. It will affect restaurants only in that they are responsible for collecting the tax which is on the ticket as a separate line item. It will not affect their profit margins or revenues. It is not a tax on restaurants. Restaurants will get money from the City in the first year to cover any costs that might be incurred when the plan is put into place.

It is a way to collect funding to support city services. Visitors will pay for the roads they use, for the police they call when they need help and for the parks and amenities they use. Currently, 10,000 residents support the needs of 30,000 people on any given day. This flips the burden onto the 20,000 folks who otherwise are not taxed by the city for the services they use.

These were difficult conversations, but the bottom line is we have to do something. The city cannot maintain our buildings and infrastructure adequately, or keep our public safety at the reasonable levels unless the sizable funding gap is closed. There is a detailed plan for how funds will be used.

It is the best way forward and we urge you to join us in voting **YES!**

(This information furnished by Keith Nelson.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Argument in Favor

What happens if it doesn't pass?

I urge you to vote **YES** for the prepared food tax measure because it's a fair way to fund city services, which are stretched past reasonable limits on any given day. With 10,000 residents, we accommodate 20,000 visitors on any given day. They use our services and so they should help pay for them. But there's a bigger issue here. This measure is about keeping Newport as special as it is.

Not many other cities our size have a vibrant Visual Arts Center and Performing Arts Center. Our parks are a true gem that residents get to enjoy all the time and visitors flock here for them. Our police and fire services are quick, responsive and essential to our quality of life. If this measure does not pass, the community impacts will be dire.

We won't see as many police officers or firefighters. It likely will take longer to respond to crises. There will continue to be garbage dumped at our parks. The graffiti will continue. Our public buildings will continue to slide into a state of disrepair. This is something that affects all of us.

There are other funding alternatives the city could pursue. Those include increased property taxes, which only property owners and residents in our community pay, and a public service fee on our utility bills. Those will hit low-income working families the hardest, if they are implemented.

This solution is fair, because it charges visitor for the services they use. It's easier on working families because eating out is a discretionary expense and it is fair to our residents who live in this special community because we want to see it continue to be wonderful.

Join me in voting **YES!**

(This information furnished by Diane Nelson.)

Argument in Favor

Prepared food tax isn't unfair to restaurants

I've seen lots of information being spread about the proposed prepared food tax and how hard it is on restaurants. I believe these proposed hazards are drastically overstated and that the measure deserves a YES vote.

First, the restaurants aren't being charged a dime. It doesn't come out of their revenues. It doesn't get paid for by them. It's a tax to the consumer of the food product. And it's marked that way on the receipt. Eating out at our fine dining establishments is a luxury. A \$50 dinner for two would cost an additional \$2.50. That's not much.

This tax is not a new thing. It's existed in this state since about 1993, when the City of Ashland adopted it. People still flock to Ashland's fantastic restaurants and spend days there, eating out, while they attend the Oregon Shakespeare Festival and enjoy the city's many amenities. I've driven through Yachats this summer. They've had this tax since 2007. Cars full of visitors are still plugging up their streets and filling their parking lots. Their venues? They look pretty full. Both cities have fantastic parks and public services. It's a win-win.

Aside from the fact that this won't hurt restaurants, the City Council included in the proposed ballot measure a grant program for \$200,000 in the first year. It will be solely dedicated to providing financial assistance to help the restaurant owners cover any costs or time that may come with implementing this new tax. The city is going out of its way to help these businesses during the transition.

This approach takes everyone into account and it's the best solution. Join me in voting YES for the prepared food tax.

(This information furnished by Ryan Parker.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Measure 21-205 Arguments

Argument in Favor

Newport needs police and fire

I support the ballot measures for the 5-cent gas tax increase and prepared food tax because, as a city, we need public services and it's the fairest way for visitors and residents to split their share of the burden.

The funding will be used to pay for more firefighters, police officers, librarians and maintaining our facilities like the Performing Arts Center that make our city the gem that it is. If the funding doesn't pass, we will see fewer police officers and firefighters. We will see rundown city facilities. We deserve better and this is a fair way to pay for it.

We have 10,000 residents in the city and about 20,000 visitors on any given day. They use our police and fire. They use our parks and our roads. That places wear and tear on those important assets that the 10,000 of us pay for. It's simple math. Let's have the visitors carry their portion of the load.

Other cities in Oregon have done this. It has NOT affected their restaurants or tourism economy in any significant way. In fact, drive through Yachats during the summer time. You'll see a vibrant town with packed restaurants and lots of visitors. Same case has been true for Ashland.

The City of Newport is even building grants into the program so that restaurants will be compensated for putting the new tax into their systems. They already file quarterly tax reports and this will just be a pass-through that restaurants collect and send along to the city. It won't cut into their margins or expenses.

This is the fairest solution to help Newport fill its funding gap and I urge you to vote **YES!**

(This information furnished by Rennie Ferris.)

Argument in Opposition

VOTE NO on City Ordinance 2185 (Measure 21-205): Sales Tax on FOOD

Dear Friends,

Keeping a business open and thriving is hard enough, but adding the COVID pandemic and all its complexities into the mix and you've got a perfect storm to push even the best run small businesses into forced retirement. During the past 18 months no industry has struggled to survive more than the restaurant industry and that's the exact industry the City of Newport chose to add additional tax burden. Never has a local government been so tone deaf and out of touch with its local businesses.

The finance committee that concocted this regressive sales tax on food was comprised of government employees and the city council and did not seek to include a representative or seek input from a single restaurant owner or small business owner. To add insult to injury the city proceeded to put this tax up for discussion on July 19th, the single busiest week of the Summer. I believe they knew most restaurant owners would be unable to attend the open forum and then proceeded to act surprised that we had an opinion on the matter. The city claims the tax "can" sunset after five years, but when was the last time the government collected a tax and then stopped?

The tax has been pitched as a tax on tourists, but let's be honest, local residents will fund the bulk of this tax. Visitors are only here in significant numbers 3-4 months of the year, but residents will pay the sales tax on meals 12 months of the year. We have serious concerns for our senior citizens and other financially dispossessed community members who depend on prepared meals and whom already struggle to balance financial stress on a fixed income.

This is a bad tax, one that would hurt those that can least afford to pay it. **Please vote NO**

Dylan McEntee

(This information furnished by Dylan McEntee, Mo's Enterprises.)

Argument in Opposition

To the Community of Newport:

We believe the approval and subsequent implementation of Ordinance 2185 - Prepared Food and Beverage Tax is not a vote that should be passed at this time.

A couple of reasons to vote "No" on the tax at this time would be:

1. Many families and other businesses have still not been able to recover from the financial impact the COVID-19 pandemic had over the course of 2020, it doesn't make logical sense to institute a tax on the restaurant industry, further impacting the ability of restaurants provide food service, maintain or grow employment opportunities for residents and continue to recover from the pandemic's impact.
2. At a time when much is still unknown about the newest Delta variant of the COVID-19 virus, instituting an additional tax could be an insurmountable obstacle for many small businesses, resulting in a lesser experience for Tourists when they visit Newport.

Again, we ask that you vote "No" on Ordinance 2185 at this time in order to allow the restaurant industry to continue to recover and provide an affordable, feasible, and excellent experience for the residents of Lincoln County and visitors alike.

Sincerely,

Rogue Ales & Spirits

(This information furnished by Christopher A Bailey, Rogue Ales & Spirits.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Measure 21-205 Arguments

Argument in Opposition

VOTE NO... This measure creates and imposes an **UNFAIR SALES TAX** on **LOCAL Food** made in your **LOCAL** restaurant by **LOCAL** workers for **LOCAL** patrons to consume in Newport.

VOTE NO SALES TAX on LOCAL made products.

If you eat in a local restaurant, you are not only feeding yourself, but you're also feeding the families that restaurant employs. If this tax passes, it will tax these peoples livelihoods creating an unfair economic disadvantage for local restaurants and patrons that enjoy it and decide to dine there.

Really, think about this...

If you go to the grocery store and purchase a box of frozen waffles made in **New York** there is **NO SALES TAX**. If you go out to eat for breakfast and get pancakes made in **Newport** then you would have to **PAY A SALES TAX of 5% on it**.

NO SALES TAX if purchased in a grocery or convenience store and **made in Chicago or some other big city**. Yet if that same person decides to dine out at your local restaurant there would be a 5% tax on the meal. **This is counterproductive to locally made and sourced products in Newport**. In all reality most of our local eateries make most of their products from scratch. These local eateries have spent a lot of time, care, and effort to create an outstanding product and atmosphere for locals and tourist alike. The result of this passing could be the loss of your favorite local eatery as they decide whether to continue business in a community that targets them or move shop to a friendlier town.

This is a **SALES TAX on LOCALLY MADE FOOD**. We should be encouraging artisan and craft restaurants in Oregon and specifically on the Oregon Coast. This **TAX** is a direct assault on local eateries which create products from scratch for their customers to enjoy.

PLEASE VOTE NO on this LOCAL SALES TAX

(This information furnished by Zachary Poole, Pig 'N Pancake.)

Argument in Opposition

Over the past 18 months our restaurant workers have been harassed, humiliated, belittled, and utterly traumatized from guests who don't understand the necessity of mask mandates, changes in operating hours, food shortages, menu changes, and other shifts in restaurant operations. The brunt of the frustration lands on the shoulders of these employees.

To add a 5% tax on an already hostile hospitality environment is the final blow to an unprecedented year and a half. The well-being, mental health, and safety of our employees needs to be at the forefront of the tourism industry to prevent an upcoming collapse.

Restaurant workers do not deserve to be penalized financially and emotionally by customers who will take this tax out on them. We need to protect our workforce and find ways to alleviate work related stressors rather than pile more on. **NO sales tax on food.**

(This information furnished by Janell Goplen, Clearwater Restaurant .)

Argument in Opposition

Newport restaurants are suffering and now is not the time to put a sales tax on meals served in restaurants. The Oregon Restaurant & Lodging Association has outlined several reasons why voters should vote "NO" on a sales tax on meals:

A Sales Tax on Meals Takes Money from Restaurant Workers

Restaurant workers compete for tip income when taxes appear on receipts. After more than a year of COVID-19, it's immoral to take income from frontline workers trying to put food on the table for their families.

A Sales Tax on Meals During a Global Pandemic is Unpredictable and Wrong

No industry was more negatively impacted by COVID-19 than the hospitality industry. Massive layoffs of employees, complete shutdowns or limited hours of operation, limits on indoor dining and increased prices or shortages from suppliers have all contributed to devastate the restaurant industry. During any economic downturn and with closures still happening monthly, sales will decline and so will funding from this sales tax on meals.

A Sales Tax on Meals Will Impact Residents

The goal of this sales tax on meals is to tax visitors to Newport but residents are the ones who will really pay. Residents will pay the sales tax on meals every time they go out to eat with friends and family unless they choose to stop patronizing local restaurants in favor of establishments outside the city limits.

A Sales Tax on Meals is Unfair

Picking on a single industry like restaurants in Newport and asking them to shoulder the burden for services everyone will use is unfair. A 5% sales tax on meals in Newport is like asking one neighborhood to pay property taxes for the rest of the city.

A better solution would be an Economic Improvement District or similar mechanism where the burden of raising revenue falls more broadly than on just struggling local restaurants.

Please Vote NO on Ordinance 2185 and reject this unfair Sales Tax on Meals.

(This information furnished by Greg Astley, Oregon Restaurant & Lodging Association.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Measure 21-206 City of Newport

Ballot Title

21-206

Funding for street resurfacing and reconstruction projects

QUESTION: Shall the City of Newport impose a year-round five cents per gallon tax on the sale of motor vehicle fuel?

SUMMARY: The tax will address street resurfacing and reconstruction needs. A five-cents per gallon tax would collect approximately \$392,000 per year that would be dedicated to street resurfacing and reconstruction projects.

The city has two primary sources of funding for street improvements, including the current local motor vehicle fuel tax of a variable one/three cents per gallon, from which the city recognizes about \$160,000 annually in taxes for the city's street resurfacing program. In addition, the city receives State Shared Revenues and transportation enhancement funds from the State of Oregon.

Based on an analysis conducted on the current level of reinvestment in the street system, the city's street overall index would fall to poor by 2030. In order to maintain a condition index of at least fair to good, the city needs to invest \$2 million per year in the street system. The increase in the motor vehicle fuel tax will be part of the investment needed to meet this target.

Explanatory Statement

The City Council has established Finance Work Groups over the past three years to develop a system for projecting the city's long-range financial condition (year one); identify options to address the structural deficit by looking at ways to reduce expenditures and/or increase revenues to provide financial sustainability (year two); and develop a five-year financial plan that achieves financial sustainability during this period (year three).

In addition, the Work Group reviewed estimates of future funding needed to properly maintain, replace, and construct streets and roadways in the City of Newport. The city has a significant gap in meeting the estimated cost of the maintenance, replacement, and construction of streets and roadways. The city has two primary sources of funding for street improvements, including the current local motor vehicle fuel tax of a variable one/three cents per gallon, from which the city recognizes about \$160,000 annually in taxes for the city's street resurfacing program. In addition, the city receives State Shared Revenues and transportation enhancement funds from the State of Oregon.

Based on an analysis conducted on the current level of reinvestment in the street system, the city's street overall index would fall to poor by 2030. In order to maintain a condition index of at least fair to good, the city needs to invest \$2 million per year in the street system. The increase in the motor vehicle fuel tax will be part of the investment needed to meet this target. The targeted investment of \$2 million would provide the ability for the city to keep up with the capital needs of its streets.

The tax on motor vehicle fuel shares the burden of street improvements with residents and non-residents who utilize the city's street system.

The Finance Work Group report recommends that the City Council consider implementing a year-round five cents per gallon motor vehicle fuel tax. The tax will address street resurfacing and reconstruction needs. A five-cents per gallon tax would generate approximately \$392,000 per year that would be dedicated to street

resurfacing and reconstruction projects.

The full text of the measure can be obtained at city hall or at www.newportoregon.gov.

(This information submitted by Margaret M Hawker, City Recorder, City of Newport.)

Argument in Favor

Join me in SUPPORTING the City Gas Tax

Like everything else in life, streets don't last forever. They take ongoing maintenance, repairs and periodic replacement as asphalt wears down under traffic. That's why I'm urging you to vote YES on the Newport City Gas Tax.

The 5 cents per gallon that is proposed would create a slight increase over the current tax collected by the city for roads, but it will generate an additional \$392,000 that we can use to fix potholes, replace and repair streets and take care of our transportation infrastructure. The city is responsible for maintaining 55 miles of streets.

We are a city of 10,000 people, but on any given day the city's streets are used by up to 30,000 people. That puts a disproportionate amount of wear and tear on our roads. Increasing the gas tax is a way to make sure the people who use our city streets fund their repair and maintenance.

Visitors and residents alike will carry their share of the cost of the roads we all use. It's the fairest thing to do. In fact, I say it's the right thing to do.

Join me in voting YES for the city's 5-cent gas tax.

(This information furnished by Dean Sawyer.)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by the County of Lincoln, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statement made in the argument.

Measure 21-207 Yachats Rural Fire Protection District

Ballot Title

21-207

Yachats Rural Fire Protection District Local Option Tax Measure

QUESTION: Shall Yachats RFPD establish a tax for operations of \$1.59 per \$1000 assessed value for five years beginning 2022-2023? This measure may cause property taxes to increase more than three percent.

SUMMARY: If this Local Option Tax is approved by voters, YRFPD will use the tax revenue to:

Retain current six full-time paid Paramedic-Firefighter employees plus replacements to fill vacations and personal leave.

Maintain and repair essential fire apparatus, trucks and personal protective equipment.

Expand volunteer recruitment program(s).

Repair and maintain essential YRFPD facilities.

Fund general operations of YRFPD.

It is estimated the new Local Option Tax will increase revenue to YRFPD by \$650,211 in 2022-2023, \$669,717 in 2023-2024, \$689,809 in 2024-2025, \$710,503 in 2025-2026, and \$731,818 in 2026-2027.

Explanatory Statement

The Yachats Rural Fire Protection District (YRFPD) provides fire, rescue and emergency medical services from just south of Yachats to the southern Waldport boundary and 10 miles up the Yachats River Valley.

Over 95% of YRFPD's income is from property taxes. YRFPD currently levies three taxes for operations, a Base Rate of .2896 cents/\$1,000 and two Local Option Taxes (shown as LOC, short for LOCAL, on tax statements) of .61 cents/\$1,000 (LOC #2) and .59 cents/\$1,000 (LOC #3) respectively. The Base Rate is fixed by law. Local Option Taxes (LOT) for operations must be renewed by voters every five years. The LOT of .61 cents/\$1,000 (LOC #2) was approved by voters in 1998 and the LOT of .59 cents/\$1,000 (LOC #3) was approved in 2007. Each LOT has been continually renewed by voters since, but neither LOT has increased in the 14 years since 2007. The current total of the three taxes is \$1.49/\$1,000 of assessed value, below the average of all rural fire protection districts in Oregon.

Since 2007, YRFPD's calls for service have more than doubled and in addition, inflation has increased all operational costs by 30-35%.

Since 2007, the number of volunteer Firefighter/EMTs has decreased from 14-16 to 2-3. This required hiring 5 additional full time paid Firefighter/Paramedics. Today, salary costs consume 80% of YRFPD's budget. For the last two years, YRFPD has had to borrow money to sustain operations.

YRFPD must now ask voters to approve a third LOT (LOC #4), in the amount of \$1.59/\$1000. If approved, it is the intent of the Board of Directors to allow existing LOT of .59 cents/\$1,000 (LOC #3) to expire on June 30, 2023. These two actions would result in a net increase of the District's tax rate of \$1.00/\$1,000, from the current overall \$1.49 to \$2.49 on July 1, 2023.

YRFPD voters approved our requested new station Bond Measure four years ago. Remaining Bond money can not be used to support general operations or buy necessary apparatus or maintain any facility.

YRFPD is continuing to provide 24/7/365 paid Firefighter/Paramedic

services, but increased costs have required us to defer needed apparatus replacement and small equipment upgrades. Of significant concern, without a volunteer-based backup, YRFPD is only able to respond to one emergency at a time and must over-rely on our Mutual Aid Agreements with Central Oregon Coast Fire and Rescue and Seal Rock Rural Fire to provide coverage.

Passage of this measure will enable YRFPD to continue to provide quality emergency services to the patrons, continue to maintain our emergency equipment, and work to recruit volunteers.

If this measure fails to pass, YRFPD will likely need to lay off three Firefighter/Paramedics and will likely only have a 1-person response for fire, medical emergencies, and rescue. This will also likely cause forfeiture of YRFPD's county-assigned ambulance license, causing its reassignment to a different ambulance provider.

Please vote.

(This information submitted by Edward T Hallahan, Secretary/Treasurer, Yachats Rural Fire Protection District)

Measure 21-208

Seal Rock Rural Fire Protection District

Ballot Title

21-208

Continuation of Local Option Tax for Seal Rock RFD

QUESTION: Shall District levy a Local Option Tax of \$0.40 per \$1,000 of assessed value for five years beginning 2022-2023? This measure renews current local option taxes.

SUMMARY: This levy is a continuation of the levies approved by the voters in 2017. The rate of the levy remains the same as previously approved at \$0.40 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation. The proposed rate will raise approximately \$234,321.90 in 2022-23; \$241,351.56 in 2023-24; \$248,592.11 in 2024-25; \$256,049.87 in 2025-26; and \$263,731.37 in 2026-27.

Although Volunteer firefighters will continue to be a vital part of the district, it still is crucial to maintain paid firefighters to continue the level of service that the district has enjoyed the last few years. This program has been successful and needs to be renewed to continue this vital service for our taxpayers.

Explanatory Statement

Since 2017 Seal Rock has employed full time firefighters. They have enhanced the capabilities of the district to respond to fires and other emergencies. Although volunteers are important, these paid firefighters have improved the operational capabilities of the district and have become a vital part of our district.

By maintaining response time and operational capabilities, these firefighters have contributed to maintaining our ISO ratings. Simply put, these ratings determine our insurance premiums.

There is no increase in the tax rate of \$ 0.40 per thousand of assessed value you will simply be renewing the current levy.

This levy will help ensure that when you call us in an emergency, we will continue to have an adequate crew to assist you. A paid crew helps smooth out the normal ups and downs of our volunteer group, and they have proven their worth over the last five years.

(This information submitted by Paul Rimola, Member of the Seal Rock Rural Fire District's Board of Directors.)