

From: [Ryan Lund](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: IRR 401 explanatory statement comment
Date: Saturday, July 30, 2022 1:39:39 PM

I am writing without the benefit of access to the committee's draft because it isn't published on the SOS website. However, I listened to the full meeting of the explanatory statement committee.

As this committee and the financial impact and racial/ethnic impact committees noted, this measure is written in such a way that its ultimate impact can't be summarized or explained except as speculation. The explanatory statement **MUST** make this clear. The impact on persons within the state is indirect: it would change the basis on which future legislative and court decisions will be decided. The explanatory statement can't just say it's an "aspirational statement." You have to help people see that, if the measure passes, the legislature would make laws and point to this measure as justification. The executive branch would make policy and point to this measure as justification. The courts would make decisions and point to this measure as justification. You can leave it to arguments for/against to speculate what all of those decisions might be, but the explanatory statement has to explain that this is how the measure would work.

Ryan Lund
Gresham

August 3, 2022

Re: Testimony regarding Explanatory Statement Measure 111 (SJR 12)

Dear Members of the Explanatory Statement Committee,

We appreciate the opportunity to supply written comment on the crafting of Measure 111 Explanatory Statement. I am writing on behalf of Health Care for All Oregon, a 501c3 statewide membership organization. Our thousands of supporters are passionate about ensuring access to care for all Oregonians.

We are appreciative of the work the explanatory committee to create a statement that is accurate and nonpartisan. We are generally in strong support of the Measure language. However, we are concerned with the exception of the phrase, “This measure is an aspirational goal.” We have two major concerns with this phrasing.

Our first concern is that “aspirational” is not neutral language as required. In floor speeches concerning SJR 12 (2021), the legislators who spoke in opposition to the bill are the legislators who described it as “aspirational.” In order to create a negative connotation. Similarly, “aspirational” sends a message to voters that this does not declare an actual right. The explanatory statement, which voters are looking to for an unbiased description, lacks neutrality if the word choice influences their vote on the measure in a negative way.

Our second concern is that that “aspirational” does not recognize specific elements of the measure. If passed, the legislature will be need to complete a process to determine if existing policies are in alignment with the constitution. If said policies are not in alignment, the legislature will be need to make policy changes to ensure that Oregonians are able to access cost-effective, clinically appropriate, and affordable healthcare. While the exact policy outcomes of this measure are unknown, the measure language, the legislative intent, and the supporting documents together demonstrate that there are specific, tangible outcomes of a “yes” vote.

We recommend the removal of “aspirational” and suggest that the Committee have the third paragraph read, “This measure does not specify what the state must do to comply with the obligation, or how compliance should be measured.”

Thank you again for your work on this explanatory statement and for considering this testimony.

Sincerely,



Tom Sincic, FNP-Retired

President, Health Care for All Oregon

president@hcao.org



Service Employees International Union – Oregon State Council
6401 SE Foster ▪ Portland, OR 97206

August 3, 2022

Dear members of the Explanatory Statement Committee and staff of the Secretary of State,

Thank you for the opportunity to offer feedback about the explanatory statement for Ballot Measure 111.

My name is Alberto Gallegos, and I am writing on behalf of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Oregon. SEIU Oregon is composed of SEIU Local 503 and SEIU Local 49, which together represent over 85,000 people. Local 49 represents private sector janitors, property service workers, light manufacturing, and healthcare workers; while Local 503 represents homecare workers, private nonprofit workers, in-home childcare providers, nursing home workers, and state and local government employees.

We agree with the vast majority of this draft with the exception of the use of the word “aspirational” in the third paragraph of this measure. We are concerned that the use of this term will discourage voters from voting for the measure since it ignores the concrete elements of the measure, such as an individual’s increased ability to sue for a remedy, and that the legislature will have to complete a process to determine if current policies and service levels fulfill the obligation of the state.

It is for that reason that we believe that the term “aspirational” does not truly embody the neutral essence that the explanatory statement is meant to portray and should be removed from the ballot measure. Instead, the third paragraph should read, “This measure does not specify what the state must do to comply with the obligation, or how compliance should be measured.”

Thank you for your work on this explanatory statement, and for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Alberto Gallegos
Political and Government Relations Organizer
SEIU, Oregon State Council

From: [Karen Baker](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot Measure 111 public comment
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 6:43:17 PM

Dear members of the Explanatory Statement Committee and staff of the Secretary of State,

My name is Karen Baker; I am from Oregon City in Clackamas County, Oregon. I am writing to offer feedback about the explanatory statement for Referral 401/Measure 111. I am very concerned about the use of the word “aspirational” in the third paragraph of this measure.

First, I understand that the explanatory statement is meant to be a neutral explanation of the measure, but “aspirational” is not neutral because it implies that it does not really create a right which has a negative connotation.

Second, that word ignores the concrete elements of the measure, such as the legislature will be called on to examine existing systems/policies for compliance and like any constitutional right there is always the option to seek legal remedy.

For these reasons, please remove the word “aspirational” from the ballot measure. Instead, the third paragraph should read, “This measure does not specify what the state must do to comply with the obligation, or how compliance should be measured.”

Thank you for your work on this explanatory statement, and for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Karen Baker

Dear members of the Explanatory Statement Committee and staff of the Secretary of State,

My name is Scott Perkins, and I'm from Glendale, Douglas County, Oregon. I am writing to offer feedback about the explanatory statement for Referral 401/Measure 111. This draft is largely good, but I am very concerned about the use of the word "aspirational" in the third paragraph of this measure.

First, I understand that the explanatory statement is meant to be a neutral explanation of the measure, but "aspirational" is not neutral because it implies that it does not really create a right which has a negative connotation.

Second, that word ignores the concrete elements of the measure, such as the legislature will be called on to examine existing systems/policies for compliance and like any constitutional right there is always the option to seek legal remedy.

For these reasons, please remove the word "aspirational" from the ballot measure. Instead, the third paragraph should read, "This measure does not specify what the state must do to comply with the obligation, or how compliance should be measured."

Thank you for your work on this explanatory statement, and for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Scott Perkins

From: [Anna Maria Dill](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot Measure Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 7:05:34 PM

Dear members of the Explanatory Statement Committee and staff of the Secretary of State,

My name is Anna Maria Dill, and I'm from Union County, Oregon. I am writing to offer feedback about the explanatory statement for Referral 401/Measure 111. This draft is largely good, but I am very concerned about the use of the word "aspirational" in the third paragraph of this measure.

First, I understand that the explanatory statement is meant to be a neutral explanation of the measure, but "aspirational" is not neutral because it implies that it does not really create a right which has a negative connotation.

Second, that word ignores the concrete elements of the measure, such as the legislature will be called on to examine existing systems/policies for compliance and like any constitutional right there is always the option to seek legal remedy.

For these reasons, please remove the word "aspirational" from the ballot measure. Instead, the third paragraph should read, "This measure does not specify what the state must do to comply with the obligation, or how compliance should be measured."

Thank you for your work on this explanatory statement, and for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Anna Maria Dill

From: [Kati Duffy](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot Measure Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 7:13:54 PM

Dear members of the Explanatory Statement Committee and staff of the Secretary of State,

My name is Kati Duffy, and I am a Washington County resident. I am writing to offer feedback about the explanatory statement for Referral 401/Measure 111. I am so excited to have the right to healthcare on the ballot, but I am very concerned about the use of the word “aspirational” in the third paragraph of this measure.

First, I understand that the explanatory statement is meant to be a neutral explanation of the measure, but “aspirational” is not neutral. The use of the phrase “aspirational goal” implies that it does not actually create a right. This creates a negative perception of the measure and could influence voters.

Second, that word ignores the concrete elements of the measure. For example, the legislature will be called on to examine existing systems/policies for compliance, and like any constitutional right there is always the option to seek legal remedy. Describing the measure as aspirational undercuts the real work that will need to be done to ensure compliance.

For these reasons, please remove the word “aspirational” from the ballot measure. Instead, the third paragraph should read, “This measure does not specify what the state must do to comply with the obligation, or how compliance should be measured.”

Thank you for your work on this explanatory statement, and for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Kati Duffy

From: [Laurie](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot measure public comment - BM 111
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 7:55:57 PM

Date: August 2, 2022
To: BM 111 Explanatory Statement Committee
From: Laurie Wimmer, Resident of Portland, Oregon (Multnomah County)
RE: *Draft Language as proposed*

Dear Explanatory Statement Committee members and Secretary of State staff,

First, thank you for your service to Oregon.

Second, please consider my comments as they relate to the measure language of the health care proposal that will be on the November 2022 ballot (Referral 401/Measure 111).

The explanation currently describes the measure with the subjective term “aspirational” – damning it with faint praise. This opinion has no place in what is supposed to serve as a neutral description of the measure.

I know that the measure directs the legislature to examine Oregon’s existing system and policies for compliance, and as with any constitutional provision, parties may seek compliance through the courts. That is not aspirational; it is concrete.

I ask that you delete the word “aspirational” from the explanation, therefore. I support a revision that reads: “This measure does not specify what the state must do to comply with the obligation or how compliance should be measured.”

Thank you so much for considering my thoughts on this important matter. Please note that I support the rest of the explanation – in all other respects, I believe the text does a good job of describing, not opining, on the proposed measure.

Sincerely,

Laurie Wimmer

From: [Emily Gibson](#)
To: [SOS Elections * SOS](#)
Subject: Ballot measure public comment
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 8:59:51 PM

Dear Explanatory Statement Committee Members and Secretary of State Staff:

My name is Emily Gibson, and I am a resident of Bend, in Deschutes County, Oregon. Thank you for your work on the explanatory statement for Referral 401/Measure 111. Though the bulk of this draft is clear and supports my hopes for this measure, I have two concerns I wanted to share, regarding the use of the word “*aspirational*” in the third paragraph of this measure.

First, while an explanatory statement is meant to be a neutral explanation of a measure, I don't consider “*aspirational*” to be neutral. Instead, “*aspirational*” communicates a hope or desire of something that the state would *like* to attain. Measure 111 is about codifying the right to health care for every Oregonian. *Aspiration* is not equivalent to *right*.

Second, the word “*aspirational*” ignores and even undermines the concrete elements of the measure, including the legislature's responsibility to examine existing systems/policies for compliance. As with any constitutional right, there is always the option to seek legal remedy.

For these reasons, I ask you to remove the word “*aspirational*” from the ballot measure. Instead, the third paragraph should read, “This measure does not specify what the state must do to comply with the obligation, or how compliance should be measured.”

Thank you for your work on this explanatory statement, and for considering my comments. I am so looking forward to voting on this measure in November!

Sincerely,

Emily Gibson

Emily Gibson
707-834-8165
1795 NE Mark Ct. Bend, OR 97701
blueheronms@yahoo.com



August 2, 2022

Re: Testimony regarding Measure 111, the Right to Health Care Amendment

Dear Members of the Explanatory Statement Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to supply written comment on the crafting of Measure 111, the Right to Health Care Amendment. I am writing on behalf of the Oregon Nurses Association, which represents more than 15,000 nurses, including RNs and advance practice nurses, and allied health professionals. Our members are very excited about Measure 111: As health care professionals, they are passionate about ensuring access to care for all Oregonians.

We are appreciative of the work the explanatory committee to create a statement that is accurate and nonpartisan. We are generally in strong support of the Measure. However, we are concerned with the exception of the phrase, "This measure is an aspirational goal." We have two major concerns with this phrasing, which will be expanded upon below.

Our first concern is that "aspirational" is not neutral language. In looking at floor speeches concerning SJR 12 (2021), the legislators who spoke in opposition to the bill are the legislators who described it as "aspirational." Similarly, "aspirational" sends a message to voters that this measure is a lofty, possibly unachievable goal. The explanatory statement, which voters are looking to for an unbiased description, lacks neutrality if the word choice influences their vote on the measure.

Our second concern is that that "aspirational" obscures the concrete elements of the measure. If passed, the legislature will be compelled to complete a process to determine if existing policies are in alignment with the constitution. If said policies are not in alignment, the legislature will be required to make policy changes to ensure that Oregonians are able to access cost-effective, clinically appropriate, and affordable healthcare. While the exact policy outcomes of this measure are unknown, the measure language, the legislative intent, and the supporting documents together demonstrate that there are specific, tangible outcomes of a "yes" vote.

Thank you again for your work on this explanatory statement, and for considering this testimony.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Paige Spence". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping underline.

Paige Spence
Director of Government Relations
spence@oregonrn.org