MARCH GENERAL MEETING

A Healthy Democracy Demands Scrutiny

“The Oregon Citizens’ Initiative Review process is, in fact, already having a positive influence on an initiative system that’s become overly corrupted...” ~ The Sandy Post

“Oregon voters should have the opportunity for this type of balanced analysis of every ballot measure.” ~ Portland Tribune

Date: March 13, 2014
Place: OEA Building, 2495 South Pacific Highway, Medford
Time: 11:30 optional brown bag lunch with coffee and tea; 12 noon—speakers
Presenters: Manju Bazzell & Judy Voruz, local volunteers for Healthy Democracy

Jackson County has been chosen as the first county in Oregon and the nation to have a ballot measure reviewed by the CIR before its election on May 20, 2014. Which measure will it be? Come to our meeting and perhaps be the first to find out.

The Program will cover the history, goals and mission of the CIR and how they match those of the League. Kappy Eaton, a member of LWVOR's Legislative team, is on Healthy Democracy’s Advisory Board and Marge Easly, former State President of LWVOR, is on their Board of Directors.

Marylou Schnoes will provide a brief, get-out-the-vote presentation, which will take place at some of the County libraries and will be staffed by LWVVRV members.

If you know anyone outside the League who's reliable and would be willing to staff an information/registration table outside the Medford, Ashland, Central Point, Talent, Rogue River or Jacksonville Libraries to inform passersby during the month April, please call her at 541-890-6163. The person must be absolutely trustworthy as she may be handling filled-out voter registration forms. Thank you.

The League of Women Voters, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages the informed and active participation of citizens in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy.
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Each year around the first day of spring, the Agriculture Council of America throws a nationwide celebration to promote public awareness and appreciation of our nation’s farmers and foresters. Consider:

American farmers are producing more and doing it more efficiently. With modern methods, one acre of land in the U.S. can produce 11,000 heads of lettuce, 25,400 pounds of potatoes, or 8,900 pounds of sweet corn. In the 1960s, one farmer supplied food for 25.8 persons in the U.S. and abroad. Today, one farmer supplies food for 129 people – 97 in the U.S. and 32 abroad.

More than 90% of U.S. farms are family owned. In the 1930s, a farmer could harvest an average of 100 bushels of corn by hand in a nine-hour day. Today’s combines can harvest 900 bushels of corn per hour or 100 bushels of corn in less than seven minutes.

The LWVRV is studying the question of agriculture. Join us as we study the “Economic Health of the Agricultural Sector,” “New Agricultural Technologies and Management Techniques,” and “Sustainable Agriculture and a Safe Food Supply.” Kathleen Donham led us in the first of two extremely interesting study sessions. Please join us for our second one on March 27th at Kathleen Donham’s home, and for our April 10th general meeting on our agricultural concensus questions.

~Carole Levi, member of the executive board
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Tuesday, February 18, 2014
OEA Building, 2495 South Pacific Highway, Medford, OR

Call to Order at 9:35 am by Executive Committee member Carole Levi

Present: Olena Black, Kathleen Donham, Carol Ingelson, Carole Levi, Iris Milan, Joan Rogers, Mary Lou Schnoes

Guest speakers: Judy Voruz and Manju Lyn Bazzell from Citizens’ Initiative Review. The speakers have been asked to give a brief presentation at the next general meeting on March 13, 2014.

Marylou Schnoes: All 6 most used branches Marylou Schnoes have been contacted and are agreeable with presence of LWVRV to obtain voter registrations.

Kathleen Dunham discussed the agriculture discussion groups, February 21st and March 27th.

Joan Rogers brought us up-to-date on plans for the LWVRV Annual Meeting, to be held on May 8th at Lark’s at Inn at the Commons.

We received a thank you note from Susan Rolle of Planned Parenthood Southwest for our support of the Human Trafficking forum.

Carole Levi gave the deadline for items to be included in the Voters Voice—February 23rd.

The budget committee met (Barbara Davidson, Kathleen Donham, Carole Levi, and Iris Milan.) Our proposed budget will be reviewed by Willie Bijon and Diane Shockey.

A report from Shiena Polehn, nominating committee chairperson, on the proposed slate for 2014-15 board and off-board members. Several positions remain vacant.

~Carol Ingelson, Secretary

LWVRV
ANNUAL MEETING
May 8, 2014
Lark’s at
Inn at the Commons
Details will follow
RECAP of FEBRUARY LWVRV MEETING

The LWVRV celebrated the 100th birthday of OSU’s Research and Extension Service in the Rogue Valley with a birthday cake and coffee.

Phil VanBuskirk, Director of OSU-SO Research and Extension Center, discussed the history, programs, and accomplishments of the Research and Extension Center’s programs in Jackson County.

Sherri Morgan, a member of the Friends of Research and Extension (FORE), described and explained the current ballot measure for its funding. She also answered questions posed to her by attendees.

FEBRUARY MEETING in PICTURES
SAVAGE CREEK, OREGON in 1936

Thank you, our LWVRV member and web administrator, Olena Black, for sharing these priceless photos taken by your mother, and giving us a glimpse of life on the Rogue in 1936.

Homemakers Camp, Home Extension, August 5, 1936.

Marguerite Black was in attendance. Her roommate was Mrs Neidmier.

I do not know whose camera was used to take these snapshots, but they are in the photo collection of Marguerite Watson Black with notes on the back of the photos.

The camp was held at Savage Creek, which is on the Rogue River.

In one of the photos you can see a car parked on the road. I don't know what year it is, but is a 1930's vintage car. The car is parked on US Highway 99, the major north/south highway linking California to Washington state.

In the photo on the left, the women are sitting on a dock that extended out into the Rouge River.

In another, you see the women waiting to have breakfast. The building is of a log construction, with a wood-shake roof.

Regards,
Annice Olena Black (daughter of Marguerite)
Jan 22, 2014

THANK YOU

"Many thanks to those of you who have sent cards, e-mails, phone calls, etc at the time of my knee surgery. Your support has really helped. Lovingly, Shiena Polehn."
50 YEARS as a LWV MEMBER

JEAN MAACK, A WOMAN OF ACHIEVEMENT

Born and raised in East Iowa, Jean Maack left home to attend the University of Illinois and earn a Bachelor’s and Master’s degree with an emphasis on science. She spent some time in research on nutrition. Soy beans no less!!

Jean and her husband had four children and while raising them, she returned to college for her teacher’s certificate then pursued a career teaching at the Junior High level. During this period, she also represented her fellow teachers as a negotiator for salaries and benefits. A busy lady, indeed.

A high point of her life was being elected president for the organization in Illinois working to get the Equal Rights Act (ERA) passed. Unfortunately the amendment did not pass. However, in 2014 we have just had the 5th anniversary of the Pay Equity Act, inspired by Lily Ledbetter. Jean has had the pleasure of seeing this victory for women.

Jean and family moved to Medford to retire and she continued with her interests in politics, women’s rights and her hobby, genealogy. She and former Governor Barbara Roberts, were responsible in starting the Rogue Valley Women’s Political Caucus in Medford. Jean has been a high achiever all her life.

We are honored to have this talented woman in our League of Women Voters, Rogue Valley branch. She has completed over 50 years of membership in the League, in Illinois and Oregon. Thank you, Jean.

~Shiena Polehn, Hospitality

AGRICULTURAL UPDATE 2014

The national LWV will be completing the Agriculture Update this Spring with the consensus questions due April 18. The LWVRV meeting for consensus on these issues is April 10 at the OEA Bldg. Members should have the condensed versions of the resource material by now (please call me and ask for a copy if you do not have one). As you read through the consensus questions supplied with this newsletter, keep in mind that we will probably not reach consensus on all these questions. However, those questions which refer to items we have discussed (e.g. funding for extension research, antibiotics in livestock, GMO use in weather-intolerant fruit trees) can serve as our focus.

A second study session is currently scheduled for March 27 at 1:30pm at my home [3776 Devils Garden Rd, Medford]. All are invited—we will be looking primarily at the third resource paper, “New Agricultural Technologies and Management Techniques”.

~Kathleen Donham  541-772-5044
CITIZENS’ INITIATIVE REVIEW BOARD—An Exciting and Innovative Process in Participatory Democracy

“The most significant attempt at initiative reform in the United States.” -Joe Mathews, NBC Los Angeles

In 1902, a group of citizens fed up with politics as usual developed the initiative and referendum process to allow citizens to create laws directly at the ballot box. Fast-forward 111 years, and the system is showing some signs of strain. Consider these results, taken from recent polls:

75% of voters support the initiative system, but
75% of voters say they often find the measures too complicated and confusing to understand, and
66% have cast ballots on measures with which they are unfamiliar.

Jackson County has been chosen by Healthy Democracy to participate in a review of a local ballot measure using the Citizens’ Initiative Review process. The Citizens’ Initiative Review (CIR) is one answer to the strain on our initiative system and to the need for more and better information. Created by Healthy Democracy, a non-partisan non-profit organization dedicated to elevating the public’s voice in our democracy; the Citizens’ Initiative Review (CIR) engages citizens to help their fellow voters make policy decisions.

HOW IT WORKS

For each measure of the ballot a panel of 24 randomly selected and demographically diverse voters is assembled. Over a 3-day period, the panel hears directly from campaigns for and against the measure and calls upon policy experts. Upon deliberation of presented information, the panel drafts a Citizens’ Statement highlighting the most important findings. The statement is published in the Oregon voters’ pamphlet. The result: a completely fair, unbiased, independent hearing by citizens of the relevant information on the ballot measure.

KEY FACTS

During the 2011 Legislative Session, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 2634 which created a commission to oversee and conduct the Citizens’ Initiative Review (CIR) in Oregon.

In 2012, over 627,000 Oregonians relied on the Citizens’ Initiative Review (CIR) statement published in the voters’ pamphlet for trustworthy information on two statewide ballot measures.

The Citizen’s Initiative Review is funded solely by charitable contributions.

The CIR has attracted media attention from around Oregon and beyond for its work in providing voters with fair and balanced information on ballot measures.

In 2012, the CIR won the International Association for Public Participation’s North American Project of the Year award and also went on to win their International Project of the Year Award.

One of the three Jackson County Ballot measures will be chosen for review. There is a strong possibility the League of Women Voters will be the first to know which ballot measure has been selected. If this has peaked your interest or passion about citizen-led democracy, please attend the March 13th meeting and be in the front row seat of this exciting movement. Learn more by visiting healthydemocracy.org and view a video about the process.
WE REMEMBER……..

Evelyn Ousterhout

Evelyn Ousterhout, a long time League member died Tuesday in Medford. She was the president of the League when I joined some 53 years ago. We had known the O’s for some years since my husband grew up with John, Evelyn’s husband and his brothers. We hiked together and spent time looking for elusive huckleberries as well as meeting socially from time to time.

When I first met Evelyn she was working earnestly on the effort to establish a charter for the Jackson county government. The efforts of the League were successful. Evelyn was a journalism major and attended both U of O and SOC where she graduated.

She worked at the Mail Tribune for some time. She was an ardent environmentalist as are her daughter, Gretchen and son Johnny.

Gretchen is married to Bob Hunter of Water Watch. Birding is another activity and interest we shared. For some years they have owned a vineyard and produce outstanding wine. Evelyn was probably one of the most intelligent and interesting people I have known

~Agnes Chirgwin

Lois Kent VanderPloeg

Lois Kent VanderPloeg, long time member of the LWVRV and past board member passed away in December at the age of 97!!

She was a super interesting lady was very interested in our International, government and environment studies and participated on Voters Service Committee.

Raised in Oregon, Lois followed her soldier first husband from Alaska thru WWII and then the Korean War serving the government and the Red Cross in various leadership capacities. While in D.C. she received a degree in History and when they moved to Medford in the 1964, taught at Talent Junior High and went on to get a Masters in Social Studies and to work with people on gaining citizenship.

She also served on the Jackson Co. Human Resources Comm. and Welfare Board, and participated in AAUW and her church.

While residing at the Manor after Mr. Kent's death, Lois met and married Mr. VanderPloeg in 2001 and began a new series of world travel under his death last summer.

Lois was a smart, active, kind, and caring lady who was an asset to our League and the Rogue Valley! She always got her facts straight and delivered them with a smile.

~Nancy Swan

DRUG TRAFFICKING FORUM

The sex trafficking forum held last month was well received, and another shorter event is scheduled for Thursday morning 9:40-10:20 March 20 in the Ashland High School Theater. High School students from the Interact Club are taking the lead in presenting this program. The film ,"Chosen", will be shown and resource people working familiar with this issue will be available for questions.

We hope community members will be able to join the students in hearing about this important issue and what we can do locally.
# Agriculture Update Consensus Questions

## Economic Health of the Agricultural Sector

### 1. Should government financial support for agriculture be directed to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Subsidized agricultural credit (loans)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Disaster assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Crop insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Farms that supply local and regional markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Subsidized implementation of best management practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Commodity crop programs, e.g., corn, soybeans, sugar, cotton, wheat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Commodity livestock program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Commodity dairy program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Specialty crops, e.g. fruits, vegetables, nuts, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Other production methods, e.g. organic, hydroponic, urban, etc. farms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

### 2. What changes should government make regarding direct payment programs to farm operators?

Note: Farm operators can be anything between family farms to huge corporations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Eliminate direct payments to farm operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Update the rules for direct payments to farm operators to support sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Broaden the types of farms that are eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Broaden the types of crops that are eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Effectively enforce existing rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
### 3. What changes to current crop insurance programs should government make?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Extend to more types of crops</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Link to the use of conservation practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Limit insurance for the cultivation of marginal and environmentally sensitive land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Cap amount of premium subsidy to a single farm operator (see note in question 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Should government act on any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Revise anti-trust legislation to ensure competitive agricultural markets</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Enforce anti-trust laws as they relate to agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Promote alternative marketing systems, including regional hub markets, farmer cooperatives, farm markets, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Animal Management

### 5. Which of the following approaches to animal management should government achieve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Transparently collect and disclose data about regulated animal feeding operations (AFOs) or aquaculture operations and about the health of animals in such regulated operations</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Apply and enforce existing clean air and clean water regulations to animal or seafood management facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Which of the following approaches to animal waste management should government require or bring about?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Treat animal waste with environmentally sound technologies for all regulated AFOs</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Prioritize federal funds to mitigate existing environmental challenges (such as Environmental Quality Incentives Program, cost share, loans, etc.) rather than construction of new facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
7. Which of the following approaches to research and development (R&D) should government fund or accomplish?

*Note: For the purpose of these questions and some questions below, “developed using any new technology” or “new technologies” refer to any of many scientific processes for developing new crops or animals with genetic engineering, nanotechnology or other new techniques, which are not the traditional breeding or hybridization techniques.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Basic research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Independent third-party (such as an academic institution) risk assessment of products developed using any new technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Research to assess the impacts of new technologies on human health and the environment, prior to their widespread adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Research that advances the continuation of diversified and sustainable agricultural systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Seed banking, research, and other means that promote and preserve genetic diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Both transparency in the reporting of research studies related to approval of new products and respect for intellectual property rights of private enterprises engaged in research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Research on long-term effects of new crops, products and processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Development of new practices and technologies to promote conservation for all types of farms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
## Food Safety

8. Which of the following approaches to food safety should government perform or fund?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Clarify and enforce pre-market testing requirements for new foods and food additives *developed using any new technology* (see note below question 7)  

b) Require developers to monitor all food products *developed using any new technology* after releasing to the market  

c) Withdraw marketing approval if products are shown to be unsafe  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Require post-market monitoring of approved pharmaceutical applications in animal production for human health and environmental impacts  

e) Require developers of new products to provide data and other materials to independent third-parties (such as academic institutions) for pre- and post-market safety assessment as appropriate  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Limit use of antibiotics in animal production to treat and control disease  

g) Fund independent third-party (such as academic institutions) risk assessment of long-term and multiple exposures from foods on human health and the environment  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h) Promote crop management practices that decrease dependency on added chemicals (pesticides, herbicides, and synthetic fertilizers)  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i) Fund, train and add personnel for assessment and compliance functions of regulatory agencies  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
# Food Labeling

9. How sufficient are the following regarding current food labeling?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>No Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Nutrition Facts on food labels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Nutrition Facts on food labels as a means of consumer education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Common allergen labeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Health and ingredient claims that consumers can understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

10. Which of the following should government achieve regarding marketing and ingredient claims on food labels?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Define (and approve for use) health and safety marketing terms (e.g. immunity support, humane, pasture-raised, natural, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Regulate the use of images or other sensory advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require that ingredient marketing claims accurately represent what is in the required ingredient list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

11. Recognizing that each food developed using any new technology can be unique, and assuming that required food labeling should be useful to consumers, should the following generalized information relating to how products or components are developed be presented on food labels?

See note below question 7. All these questions also assume some percentage threshold of new technology ingredients, such as the 0.9% used in the European Union.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
<th>Mandatory</th>
<th>No consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Contains ingredients developed using any new technology stating which technologies are involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does <strong>not</strong> contain ingredients developed using any new technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) If meat, fish, eggs, or dairy products are from animals that have consumed feed developed using any new technology stating which technologies are involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
A REMARKABLE WOMAN of ACHIEVEMENT

Common Cause’s Oregon Board Chair Kappy Eaton has been named one of this year’s Women of Achievement by the Oregon Commission for Women. The Woman of Achievement Award is presented to Oregon women for leadership and success in their area of expertise, promoting the status of women in society, reflecting a commitment to equity and diversity, and serving as exemplary role models. In honoring Kappy with this award, the Oregon Commission for Women writes:

Mary Katherine “Kappy” Eaton has been a force for Oregon women’s rights and clean government for more than sixty years. Using Common Cause, the League of Women Voters, and the American Association of University Women as her platforms, she has fought for the wellbeing of women, children, and families, as well as enhanced protections for widows under Oregon law. She has traveled to Hungary and Bosnia under the auspices of the US State Department to help ensure free and fair elections in those nations, and was called upon to assist not one, but two Oregon Secretaries of State to improve the quality of elections at home. The award will be made on April 5th, at a ceremony hosted by Secretary of State Kate Brown.

Kappy Eaton, on the Citizens Initiative Review Board, about which we will learn more at our March meeting, is frequently seen at the Legislature in Salem as a League Representative. She is a frequent writer for the LWVOR Legislative Report.

INVITATION to JOIN

2013/2014 League of Women Voters of Rogue Valley

Membership Application

Name____________________________________________

Address:_________________________City:________________

Zip________Phone _______________ e-mail_________________________

Single membership — $56.00 Spouse membership — $28.00 Full-time Student— $28.00

*May we publish the above information in our LWVRV Membership Directory? * Y  N

Check all areas below in which you are most interested in attending a branch meeting:

☐ Land use planning. ☐ Local Government ☐ Transportation

☐ Children at Risk ☐ Education ☐ Election Issues

☐ Health Issues ☐ Environment ☐ National Issues

☐ Observer Corps ☐ Other_______

Please send your completed membership application, along with your check, to:

LWVRV, P.O. Box 8555, Medford, OR, 97501
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat/Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/9 Daylight Savings begins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13 LWVRV general meeting, see p. 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18 LWVRV board Meeting, see p.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27 2nd LWVRV agricultural study group</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOOKING AHEAD**

- April 10, 2014  concensus meeting on agriculture
- April 29, 2014  voter registration/party change deadline
- May 2, 2014      ballots mailed to voters
- May 8, 2014      LWVRV Annual Meeting
- May 20, 2014     General election

**WE NEED YOUR HELP!**

At this time, the following positions remain open on the 2014-15 LWVRV Board and Off-Board:

- 2 members of the executive board, Publicity chairperson, Action committee chairperson, Nominating committee member

Please call any member of the board to volunteer or for further information. Thank you.