GENERAL MEETING

Date: Thursday, November 12, 2015

Time: 11:30am—12 noon luncheon served (optional or come at noon for meeting)

12noon—1:00pm program (Public is invited)

1:00—2:00pm (at the latest) fill out concensus

Location: Climate City Brewing Company, 509 SW G Street, Grants Pass. Street parking is available, as well as, in the bank parking lot across from Climate City.

Lunch: $15.00, includes gratuity.

spinach dip for the table, side salad, a slice of pizza (meat or vegetarian,) coffee/tea.

*Gluten-free menu ~ burgers – tacos – pizza ~ available (may be at a slightly higher price.)

Please call: Barbara Empol ~ 541-899-1932 to make your reservation.

Speaker: Joanne Cleckner, LWVRV co-president

Topic: “Money and Politics” - PAC’s – Supreme Court Decision – Personal Contributions – Corporations – Not For Profit Organizations

Carpools available:

Ashland: Jan Craigie, 541-488-3710

Jacksonville via Gold Hill I-5 exit: Barbara Empol, 541-899-1932

Central Point’s Pilot truck stop near I-5 exit: Marylou Schnoes, 541-890-6163
I have been tasked with presenting at our November meeting a program on the LWV Money in Politics Review and Update. To me personally, this is a very interesting topic. Before I began my research, really all I knew about was the Citizens United Supreme Court case. The history of this topic goes back much further than that case.

Did you know that the League has been a national leader on campaign finance reform since the 1970s? The League has had positions on campaign finance since January 1974; that position was revised in 1982. We are in the process of revising the position again. We will be answering a set of consensus questions after the presentation on November 12th. Please plan on having the meeting extended for half an hour to give us time to work on these consensus questions.

The legislation to regulate campaign finance began with the Tillman Act in 1907. The Act banned campaign contributions from banks and corporations. In 1947 the Taft Hartley Act banned contributions from unions. And after Watergate there were amendments to the 1971 Federal Election Campaign Act.
BOARD MEETING MINUTES SUMMARY

Monday, October 12, 2015 at the home of Lorraine Werblow


The meeting convened at 1:15.

The September minutes were edited and accepted as changed.

Lorraine was in touch with the non-profit “A Better Oregon”, with whom we haven’t yet allied. They’re working on petitions to put up ballot measures related to minimum wage, immigration, education, corporate taxes and other topics. When those petitions meet the requirements and ballot measures are finalized, LWVRV will have a discussion with pros and cons and consider positions.

On October 31st, there’ll be a series of workshops in Eugene, one of which is on what tax status [e.g., 501c (3)] means. Lorraine will attend.

Diane presented a financial report.

Jan Craigie will begin doing some Observer Corps for county commissioner meetings after she meets with Joyce. Commissioner Breidenthal had questioned Joyce about her description of events in the Voters Voice related to his absences.

Joyce wrote a letter for president’s signature, expressing the need for such transparency, as supported by League positions, and gave detailed citations in the letter. Kathleen and Diana Murdoch are working on a membership directory, which will be printed soon.

Joyce will type into an e-document the list of email addresses collected at our OLLI outreach table. Olena will create a mailing list.

The November meeting in Grants Pass will be at Climate City Brew Pub/Restaurant, from 11:30 to 2:00. Attendees can get pizza—a large slice—for $15.

Lorraine will try to set up an appointment to meet with the Mail Tribune editor to encourage greater publicity via the paper.

Joan went to the Maslow Project office and was impressed by the facilities. She will ask them what age group or population typically doesn’t have its needs met, and will get back to us. We’ll have this meeting at OEA.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40.

~Marylou Schnoes, Recording Secretary
SPOTLIGHTING OUR LWVRO MEMBERS

Meet Emily Pfeiffer, Our New, Eager Student Member

You will enjoy meeting Emily Pfeiffer. She was born and raised in Tigard, Oregon and graduated from Tigard High in 2013. She is very much an Oregon girl.

She decided to attend Southern Oregon University because it offered a good psychology program and was more affordable than other Oregon universities.

How did Emily get interested in politics? She was recruited to register people to vote by the Student Government in her freshman year. She was then made a senator as a sophomore and now is the Director of Governmental Affairs. She is very interested in Voter Registration and often encourages students to register to vote so their voices can be heard by legislators. Does she sound like someone we could use? I would think so!!

Emily also sits on the Board of Directors of the Oregon Student Association and the United Students’ Association, which work on accessibility and affordability for higher education on a statewide level (OSA) and a national level (USSA).

Emily’s hobbies besides student government, are reading and hiking and Southern Oregon is just the place for all three. So welcome to the Rogue Valley and the League of Women Voters.

~Shiena Polehn, Hospitality

The publicity committee is seeking members to join the committee to help create and distribute information about the league. This could include creating brochures, flyers, writing articles/PSA's, guest speaking to other organizations, etc. Contact Joanne Haddad, 541-535-1284, if you are interested in helping.

~Joanne Haddad, Publicity chairperson
IN the ARCHIVES—the LWVRV in the NINETIES

A Tidings ad on 8-21-90 stated:

“We study, monitor, probe, analyze, inform, lobby, train, educate, litigate, mobilize, publish, testify.” A great idea for today. The League of Women Voters of Ashland invites all men and women interested to call (phone number.)”

Open spaces in Ashland was a heavily - debated issue in the ’90-91 League year. A chair of Open Spaces was added to the roster of offices, in anticipation of the ballot measures 53 and 54. Members studies the issue, then had an open meeting where community groups on both sides of the issues presented their ideas. Following this, the League established a position. Then members wrote, as citizens, their opinions for the editorial page. Maxine Goff, chair of the Open Spaces committee, and the League president, Anna Hust, wrote to the editor, as well., identifying their position as the League’s.

When Ashland School Board Position 2 became open, the Tidings published an interview with each candidate and also announced a 3-8-90 forum, for the candidates at the City Council Chambers, sponsored by the Ashland League of Women Voters, AAUW Ashland, the Associated Students at SOSC and the Oregon Nurses Association District 25. These four groups co-sponsored several political events during the year.

A Stage Door Canteen was held at the Ashland Elks Club as a fund raiser. There was an open bar, light refreshments, a jitterbug contest and the band, “Three Hits and a Miss.” Tickets of $7.50 were sold at Cripple Creek Music.

~Susan Orth, Historian Committee Chairperson

LWVRV CANDY FUNDRAISER

A gentle reminder that if you have not already placed your candy order, please contact:

Judith Kurinsky, 541-499-7742 or kurinsky26@gmail.com.

Orders are due by the November 12, 2015 general meeting. Delivery will be made at the December 10, 2015 general meeting, allowing you ample time to mail these goodies out for holiday gifts.

Thank you for supporting your LWVRV!
The 2002 Bipartisan Campaign Finance Act dealt with the “soft money” loophole.

On the judicial side, since the 1970s, the Supreme Court has agreed that regulating the financing of political speech raises First Amendment concerns. The League does have a position in favor of protecting the individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution, including free speech. The courts have developed a process for analyzing fundamental rights issues such as freedom of speech. The League is hoping to revise its position by focusing on the extent to which political campaigns are protected speech under the First Amendment.

The judicial history began in 1976 with *Buckley v Valeo*, here the Court ruled candidate could not be curtailed by limits on their spending in order to get their message out. The Court also held that limits on donations to candidates can be limited to prevent corruption. I’ll also give you the history of several other landmark cases from 1990 *Austin v Michigan Chamber of Commerce*, to 2010 *Citizens United v FEC* - which overturned the Tillman Act and *Austin* as well - and in 2014 *McCutcheon v FEC*.

So, this is a taste of the upcoming program. The issues are both interesting and complicated. I hope to be able to give you the tools for you to make an informed decision regarding the MIP consensus question.

Hope to see you on November 12th.

~Joann Cleckner, co - President

---

**TEST YOUR ELECTION KNOWLEDGE**

1. When were women first permitted to vote in the United States?
   - a. 1776  
   - b. 1865  
   - c. 1920

2. At the time the Constitution was written, who was allowed to vote in U.S. elections?
   - a. White male property owners  
   - b. All men, regardless of race, creed, or color.  
   - c. No one was initially given the right to vote.

3. Which president won both the highest popular vote and the most electoral college votes in an election?
   - a. Ronald Reagan  
   - b. John Kennedy  
   - c. Woodrow Wilson

4. Which presidents were elected even though they lost the popular vote?
   - a. Four: John Quincy Adams, Rutherford B. Hayes, Benjamin Harrison, and George W. Bush  
   - b Two: Jimmy Carter and George W. Bush  
   - c. None

5. Women throughout the United States were given the right to vote in 1920 with the passage of the 19th Amendment. But what was the first territory or state to grant women the right to vote?
   - a. California  
   - b. Virginia  
   - c. Wyoming
MONEY in POLITICS CONSENSUS QUESTIONS

This update on Money In Politics builds on the League’s current position on campaign finance. The consensus questions in Part I address the goals of campaign finance regulation in terms of democratic values. The questions in Part II relate to the extent to which First Amendment protections like free speech and freedom of the press should apply to various speakers and activities in the campaign finance context. Part III asks about methods of campaign finance regulation. You are asked to respond to the questions without regard for the Supreme Court’s current views on the First Amendment. In responding to each question, please interpret the words in their most general sense. Keep in mind that the LWV intentionally words positions that are derived from member study in the broadest possible way so that our positions have relevance for many years. Future national Boards will determine when and how to apply our positions.

An optional comment section is included at the end of each of the three parts. Please note that while comments will be read and considered, only responses to questions can be tabulated. PLEASE BRING THIS to the November 12th meeting.

PART I QUESTIONS: Democratic Values and Interests with Respect to Financing Political Campaigns

1. What should be the goals and purposes of campaign finance regulation?

(Please respond to each item in Question 1.)

a. Seek political equality for all citizens.
   □ Agree □ Disagree □ No consensus

b. Protect representative democracy from being distorted by big spending in election campaigns.
   □ Agree □ Disagree □ No consensus

c. Enable candidates to compete equitably for public office.
   □ Agree □ Disagree □ No consensus

d. Ensure that candidates have sufficient funds to communicate their messages to the public.
   □ Agree □ Disagree □ No consensus

e. Ensure that economic and corporate interests are part of election dialogue.
   □ Agree □ Disagree □ No consensus

f. Provide voters sufficient information about candidates and campaign issues to make informed choices.
   □ Agree □ Disagree □ No consensus

g. Ensure the public’s right to know who is using money to influence elections.
   □ Agree □ Disagree □ No consensus

h. Combat corruption and undue influence in government.
   □ Agree □ Disagree □ No consensus

2. Evaluate whether the following activities are types of political corruption:

(Please respond to each item in Question 2.)

a. A candidate or officeholder agrees to vote or work in favor of a donor’s interests in exchange for a campaign contribution.
   □ Agree □ Disagree □ No consensus

b. An officeholder or her/his staff gives greater access to donors.
   □ Agree □ Disagree □ No consensus

OPTIONAL COMMENTS (250 word limit): continued on p. 8
c. An officeholder votes or works to support policies that reflect the preferences of individuals or organizations in order to attract contributions from them.
☐ Agree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ No consensus

d. An office holder seeks political contributions implying that there will be retribution unless a donation is given.
☐ Agree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ No consensus

e. The results of the political process consistently favor the interests of significant campaign contributors.
☐ Agree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ No consensus

OPTIONAL COMMENTS (250 word limit):

**PART II QUESTIONS: First Amendment Protections for Speakers and Activities in Political Campaigns**

This set of questions is designed to determine the extent to which the First Amendment protections of free speech and freedom of the press should apply to different speakers or activities in the regulation of campaign finance. Free speech and free press provide essentially the same protections to speakers, writers, publishers and advertising, whether or not they are part of the institutional press, and largely regardless of the medium. Essentially, these protections extend to any conduct that is expressive. Many of the options below would be found unconstitutional by the current Supreme Court, but we are seeking your League's views, not those of the Court. These are broad, overarching questions about spending to influence an election, including independent spending, contributions to candidates, broadcast news and other communication expenditures.

I. Many different individuals and organizations use a variety of methods to communicate their views to voters in candidate elections. Should spending to influence an election by any of the following be limited?

(Please respond to each item in Question 1.)

a. Individual citizens, including wealthy individuals like George Soros and the Koch Brothers.
☐ Spending banned  ☐ Some spending limits  ☐ Unlimited spending  ☐ No consensus

b. Political Action Committees, sponsored by an organization, such as the League of Conservation Voters, Chevron, the American Bankers Association, and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), whose campaign spending comes from contributions by individuals associated with the sponsoring organization, such as employees, stockholders, members and volunteers.
☐ Spending banned  ☐ Some spending limits  ☐ Unlimited spending  ☐ No consensus

c. For-profit organizations, like Exxon, Ben and Jerry’s, General Motors, and Starbucks, from their corporate treasury funds.
☐ Spending banned  ☐ Some spending limits  ☐ Unlimited spending  ☐ No consensus

d. Trade associations, like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Wind Energy Association, and the American Petroleum Institute, from the association’s general treasury funds.
☐ Spending banned  ☐ Some spending limits  ☐ Unlimited spending  ☐ No consensus

e. Labor unions, like the United Autoworkers and Service Employees International, from the union’s general treasury funds.
☐ Spending banned  ☐ Some spending limits  ☐ Unlimited spending  ☐ No consensus

f. Non-profit organizations, like the Sierra Club, Wisconsin Right to Life, Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, American Crossroads, and Priorities USA, from the organization’s general treasury funds.
☐ Spending banned  ☐ Some spending limits  ☐ Unlimited spending  ☐ No consensus

*continued on p. 9*
g. Non-partisan voter registration and GOTV (get out the vote) organizations and activities, like the LWV and Nonprofit Vote.

☐ Spending banned  ☐ Some spending limits  ☐ Unlimited spending  ☐ No consensus

h. Political parties, like the Republicans, Libertarians, and Democrats.

☐ Spending banned  ☐ Some spending limits  ☐ Unlimited spending  ☐ No consensus

i. Candidates for public office spending money the candidate has raised from contributors.

☐ Spending banned  ☐ Some spending limits  ☐ Unlimited spending  ☐ No consensus

j. Candidates for public office spending their own money.

☐ Spending banned  ☐ Some spending limits  ☐ Unlimited spending  ☐ No consensus

2. The press plays a major role in candidate elections through editorial endorsements, news coverage, and other communications directly to the public that are often important to the outcome. Should such spending to influence an election by any of the following be limited?

(Please respond to each item in Question 2.)


☐ Spending banned  ☐ Some spending limits  ☐ Unlimited spending  ☐ No consensus

b. Television and other electronic media, like Fox News, CNN, MSNBC and CBS.

☐ Spending banned  ☐ Some spending limits  ☐ Unlimited spending  ☐ No consensus

c. Internet communications, like Huffington Post, Breitbart, Daily Kos, and individual bloggers.

☐ Spending banned  ☐ Some spending limits  ☐ Unlimited spending  ☐ No consensus

OPTIONAL COMMENTS (250 word limit):

PART III QUESTIONS: Methods for Regulating Campaign Finance to Protect the Democratic Process

1. In order to achieve the goals for campaign finance regulation, should the League support?

(Please respond to each item in Question 1 a and b.)

a. Abolishing SuperPACs and spending coordinated or directed by candidates, other than a candidate’s own single campaign committee.

☐ Agree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ No consensus

b. Restrictions on direct donations and bundling by lobbyists? (Restrictions may include monetary limits as well as other regulations.)

☐ Agree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ No consensus

c. Public funding for candidates? Should the League support:

(You may respond to more than one item in Question 1 c.)

i. Voluntary public financing of elections where candidates who choose to participate must also abide by reasonable spending limits?

☐ Agree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ No consensus

ii. Mandatory public financing of elections where candidates must participate and abide by reasonable spending limits?

☐ Agree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ No consensus

iii. Public financing without spending limits on candidates?

☐ Agree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ No consensus

2. How should campaign finance regulations be administered and enforced?

(You may choose more than one response for Question 2.)

☐ a. By an even-numbered commission with equal representation by the two major political parties to ensure partisan fairness (current Federal Election Commission [FEC] structure)?
☐ b. By an odd-numbered commission with at least one independent or nonpartisan commissioner to ensure decisions can be made in case of partisan deadlock?

☐ c. By structural and budget changes to the FEC (e.g., commission appointments, staffing, security, budget, decision making process) that would allow the agency to function effectively and meet its legislative and regulatory mandates.

☐ d. No consensus.

OPTIONAL COMMENTS (250 word limit):

MONEY in POLITICS CONSENSUS QUESTIONS

continued from p. 9

OBSERVER CORPS

Joyce Chapman – Jackson County (JC) Commissioners 9/29/15: All Commissioners present. (1) Staff from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and Jackson Baures, JC Public Health Division Manager, made a presentation regarding the status of air quality and air quality monitoring in JC. JC meets the standards on most days (except during fire season) but is close to the maximum standard level. Wood stoves and open burning are primary sources of pollution. Being close to the maximum standard has a negative impact on attracting new industry to JC because if they add to the pollution enough to put JC over the maximum standard, they may have to install expensive scrubber equipment. Eliminating wood stoves and reducing open burning would help create more of a buffer and make it easier to attract industries. BLM and USF are not subject to DEQ regulations and burn on non-burn days, but try to do it in a way that will not contribute to pollution. (2) Oregon Liquor Control Commission (OLCC) Rules Advisory Committee (RAC) on Draft Marijuana Rules – Breidenthal was appointed to the OLCC RAC on marijuana as a consequence of his duties on the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC) board. He said he represents 36 counties at the OLCC RAC. Breidenthal sought input on the draft rules re canopy coverage and permission to use staff and County Counsel time to re-draft certain provisions. After an approximately two hour discussion, Roberts and Dyer agreed with Jordan that “permissive” rather than “mandatory” language regarding local control was preferable. Permission to use staff and County Counsel resources was not granted.

Jackson County Commissioners 10/13/15: All Commissioners present. Rogue Disposal and Recycling (RDR) made a request to increase yard debris container charges from $4.50 to $6.50/mo. Under the franchise agreement with JC, RDR is permitted an operating cost margin of 81% to 87% (a profit margin of 19% to 13%). Current rates for yard debris have not kept pace with the franchise agreement and $6.50/mo. will bring them into compliance. After considerable discussion the Commissioners directed staff to prepare an order increasing the rate to $6.50/mo. Next topic: Discussion of AOC Annual Conference Tasting Session: Breidenthal requested that JC participate in the marketing event which is an extra day at the end of the otherwise educational conference. Products from JC would be offered for display and tasting. Roberts and Dyer explored the possibility of a non-staffed booth and lesser involvement. Breidenthal offered to stay and staff the booth. Jordan raised ethical and other issues and pointed out that the current policy is that JC does not participate in the tasting event. Dyer and Roberts saw no reason to change the policy. JC will not participate.

continued on p. 11
Next topic: Update on Governor’s Executive Order 12-07: Kelly Manning reported that JC and Josephine County are in agreement to move forward with a contract to extend the time to complete the project. Douglas County disagrees. JC and Josephine County can move forward without Douglas County. Manning will call Douglas County and attempt to gain agreement again. The session ended but Breidenthal addressed me regarding the reporting of his absences. Apparently, he prefers to give a verbal report. Breidenthal is out of the office on business related to the county. Roberts and Dyer have been absent because they attended an AOC commissioner training. Breidenthal was out last week in Boise, ID at a national meeting. He is Vice President of the national association related to counties (I did not catch the exact name of the group). He believes he was able to accomplish important things for JC by attending in person.

Jan Craigie & Joyce Chapman – JC Commissioners 10/15/15: Breidenthal absent. Roberts and Dyer present. Jordan provided explanations for various items that will appear on the Wednesday agenda. Of note is a change in the name of various advisory boards under the Public Health Advisory Committee. Essentially, the name changes are being made to reflect what is actually happening (and has been for a long time). Liaison Reports: Roberts reported on the Traffic Safety meeting (pedestrian fatalities are up 30%), Transportation Advisory Committee, City of Eagle Point, and an AOC teleconference for the legislative committee concerning the temporary marijuana rules. Dyer reported on SOREDI and EDGE meeting. Andrea Carlson, Business Relations Manager, is resigning. Kathy Trautman who handles business lending, will take on Andrea’s duties until a replacement can be found. Jordan reminded everyone that part of the $250,000 given to SOREDI was to increase service levels specifically in the business relations arena. The position should not remain vacant for long. Other updates on SOREDI were given. Dyer attended the Fair Board/Expo meeting for Breidenthal who was out of town. Various financial matters were discussed and updates given. Tom Humphries made a presentation to the Fair Board about placing the Viet Nam War Memorial at the Expo. Jordan reminded all that the Fair Board does not have authority to place it on the grounds without approval from the commissioners. Roberts and Dyer reviewed their calendars for the coming week.

~ Joyce Chapman, Observer Corps Chairperson

**Jackson County Special Election - November 3, 2015**

City of Gold Hill; City of Phoenix; Rogue River Fire District #1

To download Voter’s Pamphlet, go to:


ArticleID/242950/Voters-Pamphlet-Nov-3-Special-Election
At the LWVRV’s general meeting on October 8th, Alice Bartlett, lobbyist for LWVOR, presented an informative discussion on how lobbying works and issues on which she is lobbying.

Thanks to Iris Milan for taking these pictures in my absence.
When presenting at the September general meeting on the National Popular Vote (NPV) I was asked a great question, not exactly about the NPV compact, but about the Electoral College. The member quizzed me on why, if the Electoral College is not in the constitution, does eliminating it (to have direct elections) need a constitutional amendment. I admitted to not having the most articulate answer. I said that it would be more a matter of addition, putting in the right to vote for president and eliminating the phrase “exclusive and plenary,’ giving rights to the states to decide how electoral votes are used (a phrase which the NPV compact is based upon). I spoke about administrative changes, but those are not related to the constitutional issue.

Two things I realize need(ed) clarification. First and foremost, the Electoral College AS IT STANDS is not in the constitution, but the CONCEPT of the electors IS – and it does state a fixed number of electors. Additionally, there is an amendment which gives Washington DC voting electors and other amendments addressing issues such as timing of the seating for the office. Thus these things would need a constitutional change. Secondly, I neglected to say the word ‘uniformity.’ To have a direct election of the president we would have to have a uniform system for all states (and again, the actual declared right to vote). As I mentioned, the states have ‘exclusive and plenary’ rights over their electors and that would have to be changed to enforce uniformity. The NPV compact would NOT need these constitutional changes. A reminder that the NPV compact itself does NOT eliminate the Electoral College and simply works within its bounds to make sure every vote is equal, in every state and in every presidential election. Hope this clarification is helpful.

~ Dr. Barbara Klein, National Action Chairperson

---

**INVITATION to JOIN**

2015/2016 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
Following our tradition of learning about local non-profit organizations and helping them out during the festive season, we're asking you to save the date of Thursday, Dec. 10 at 11:30 a.m. at the OEA Building. LWVRV will be presenting some excellent speakers from the Maslow Project, well-known for its successful aid to children of all ages up to 21, some of whom are homeless. Be thinking about some seasonal food to share with our guests and some small gifts for the children. We'll give you some suggestions closer to the time. This is a nice opportunity to bring a friend, especially someone interested in joining the League.

~Joan Rogers and Shiena Polehn