Southern and Eastern Oregon, and Northernmost California Can Become a Part of Idaho

This proposal is different from secession because it is simply a shift in borders that does not affect the balance of power in the US Senate. It does not create a new state or increase the number of states.

Borders between states have been relocated or redefined many times in US history. If a deal were made that two state legislatures pass, a border change would almost certainly become a reality. According to a peer-reviewed law journal, “Prior to 1921, 36 compacts between states were put into effect with the consent of Congress; virtually all of these settled boundaries between contiguous states.” See link:

http://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?&article=1544&context=penn_law_review

The most recent example was land transferred from Minnesota to North Dakota in 1961.

The US House of Representatives approved a state border change as recently as June 19, 2002. However, at that time the US Senate Majority Leader blocked the vote in the Senate for personal financial reasons. The deal, concerning Wendover, Utah, was approved by voters on both sides of the Utah/Nevada border.

This proposal presents options for Oregon and California to move their borders to put conservative counties on the other side of their borders to make Idaho bigger.

A January 2019 poll of those categorized as “liberal” or “very liberal”, living in the blue part of a state showed that 2/3 were willing to let low-income Trump-voting counties in their state become a part of another state. Although this was an Illinois poll, we hope that a poll of Oregon and California would yield similar results. Most legislators in the majority party in these states are more concerned about primary elections than general elections because they have safe seats, so it is liberal opinion that they follow. The poll is here: www.facebook.com/PeacefulBlueStateSecession/posts/404662573642356

The Democratic Party has a supermajority in the legislatures of Oregon and California, and the governors are Democrats. These legislatures can be expected to be in favor of strengthening the position of their party in their state by letting Trump-voting counties leave. They should be in favor of improving their state finances by allowing the departure of counties that don’t pay their share of income and sales taxes because of lower incomes.

After the border change, the remainder of Oregon (northwestern Oregon) would have an annual per capita personal income (2017 BEA) $1869 higher than Oregon’s is. This would allow Oregon taxes to be decreased so that the average Oregon wage earner would save $341 in taxes annually, assuming a marginal tax rate of 11% (the typical Oregonian earner is in the 9% state income tax bracket, but also pays other taxes). The territory that we propose removing from Oregon has only 21% of the population of Oregon.
After the border change, the remainder of California (excluding northernmost California) would have an annual per capita personal income (2017 BEA) $148 higher than California’s is now. This would allow California taxes to be decreased so that the average California wage earner would save $29 in taxes annually, assuming a marginal tax rate of 11.8% (the typical California earner is in the 9.3% state income tax bracket, but also pays other taxes). This improvement is large considering that California would only lose 0.9% of its population (less than one percent).

Southern and eastern Oregon, as well as northernmost California, wish to be under red-state law. These areas in the 2016 presidential election gave 2.05 votes to Trump for every Hillary vote. Idaho has less demanding laws and regulations on home building and businesses, so Oregon’s 2018 cost of living was 39% higher than Idaho’s. California’s was 47% higher.
Idaho would benefit from this proposal. The state government would gain economies of scale, as the population would increase by 71% to 2.9 million, making it almost half the population of the average US state. At first, the average income of “Greater Idaho” would be one third of one percent lower than the current average, but the economies of the new parts of Greater Idaho would soon boom when released from the shackles of blue-state laws, regulations, and taxes. Idaho would no longer be a land-locked state, which could allow it to gain more political autonomy in the future. Idaho would have the satisfaction of freeing 1.2 million people from blue state law.

It is very unlikely that the legislature of Oregon or California would allow the creation of a new state because they would not want more Republicans in the US Senate, and giving them US senators affects the presidential electoral college. Even Congress is unlikely to approve the creation of a new state, even when it is controlled by Republicans. From the point of view of US Senators, giving extra senators to every state that is willing to become multiple states is a dangerous precedent that would weaken the voice of their own state. This is all the more dangerous today, when progressives are looking for ways to ameliorate their disadvantage in the electoral college.

If you favor the idea of “Greater Idaho”, please read the section of this proposal on Next Steps. We need your help to spread the word about this idea; please join our group at https://www.facebook.com/groups/GreaterIdaho

Why the Oregon and California Legislatures are Likely to Approve this Deal

1.) Financial Reasons: Important financial benefits to Oregon and California are described above. By letting relatively poor counties go, Oregon’s and California’s average income becomes much higher. Making the average income higher by reducing the number of poor counties in the state would not directly increase a resident’s income, but it would help the state government’s finances to the point that the state could reduce tax rates, or at least reduce the budget deficit. This effect is very large and would pay off every year.

The loss of a large amount of land should not concern the state legislature because there is no state property tax. A state legislature cares about the per capita or per household income of an area because this indicates whether this area is a net contributor or net drain on the state
government’s budget. State government revenue comes almost entirely from income taxes and sales tax (see below). Corporate taxes are a very small part of state revenues. As far as the state budget is concerned, people and their incomes matter, not land area. The only thing Oregon and California have to lose is the satisfaction of seeing a large footprint when they look at a map. Here’s the data for Oregon’s state budget:

**SCHEDULE I. SUMMARY OF GENERAL FUNDS REVENUES BY MAJOR SOURCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Taxes</td>
<td>$16,039,408,000</td>
<td>$17,771,605,000</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>$19,024,777,000</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>$19,031,047,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Excise and Income Taxes</td>
<td>1,194,026,000</td>
<td>1,267,767,000</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>964,041,000</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1,015,341,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Taxes</td>
<td>139,215,000</td>
<td>146,756,000</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>142,611,000</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>142,611,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate Taxes</td>
<td>322,026,000</td>
<td>353,665,000</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>341,984,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>341,984,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarette Taxes</td>
<td>70,480,000</td>
<td>67,149,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>65,709,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>65,709,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Tobacco Products Taxes</td>
<td>62,362,000</td>
<td>65,423,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>68,203,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>68,203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Taxes</td>
<td>1,802,000</td>
<td>1,724,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,636,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,636,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fines and Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Court Fees</td>
<td>114,542,000</td>
<td>120,422,000</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>120,863,000</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>120,863,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State Corporation Fees</td>
<td>66,448,000</td>
<td>71,112,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>70,837,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>70,837,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Fines and Assessments</td>
<td>41,158,000</td>
<td>52,651,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>60,680,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>60,529,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities Fees</td>
<td>24,021,000</td>
<td>23,293,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>23,782,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>23,782,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Charges for Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,277,000</td>
<td>10,876,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>10,876,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>10,876,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sales Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>261,947,000</td>
<td>306,841,000</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>343,337,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>362,319,469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interest Earnings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,873,000</td>
<td>50,187,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>62,122,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>62,122,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>2015-17 Actuals</th>
<th>2017-19 Current Estimates</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2019-21 Current Law Forecast</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2019-21 Governor’s Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,462,000</td>
<td>11,089,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>13,500,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>13,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**One-time Transfers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-time Transfers</th>
<th>2015-17 Actuals</th>
<th>2017-19 Current Estimates</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2019-21 Current Law Forecast</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2019-21 Governor’s Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140,883,000</td>
<td>111,425,000</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>64,909,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total General Fund Revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18,523,250,000</td>
<td>$20,434,155,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$21,335,169,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$21,456,459,916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oregon and California counties would need to agree to take their share of their state debt as they depart the state. These debts and unfunded liabilities are already owed by each citizen of these states, so it is not really a cost of the border change.

Oregon and California are counting on their current population to pay the pensions for state employees that have already been obligated. Departing counties would need to agree on a scheme that would compensate Oregon and California for the loss of their population, by agreeing to pay into the pension fund according to a schedule. Idaho would need to avoid
forcing the new counties to pay for the portion of Idaho state pensions that were already earned before the counties joined Idaho.

Oregon’s Willamette Valley, where agriculture, industrialization, and urbanization occur, remains united after the border change. 99% of the lowland agricultural portion of California’s Central Valley remains united as well.
2.) Political: This proposal increases the power and sovereignty of the areas that remain in Oregon because it eliminates the political influence of the counties that leave the state. The population of Oregon would decrease 21%.

By letting conservative counties go, this deal makes the position of the Democratic Party stronger in Oregon and California. Their electorates would become more progressive. One way to measure the difference is to look at the 2016 election. In 2016, Trump won 39.1% of Oregon’s vote. If the border had been changed beforehand, Trump would have won 33.5%. This border change would make the percentage Trump vote in Oregon less than that of the states of Washington and New York, although still more than Vermont, Massachusetts, and California.

In California, the border change reduces the population by only 0.9%. But the number of Trump voters would be reduced by 2%. Trump won 31.6% of California’s vote, but with this border change it would have been 31.3%. This small benefit comes at little cost.

Idaho is one of the four reddest states in the US, so there is no risk that giving Idaho conservative counties would cost a Democrat an Idaho election.

The US Congress seats covering these departing counties are already held by Republicans, so this border change does not affect the balance of the US House of Representatives.
The US Senate would not be affected because Oregon and California would remain Democrat and Idaho would remain Republican.

For presidential elections, there are 538 electoral votes in the country. For every 754,000 people that move from a blue state to a red state, Republicans gain one electoral vote, which is only 0.19% of 538. Since the population of the departing counties from Oregon is 856,121, Oregon would usually have one less electoral vote. The loss of electoral vote(s) would not take effect until the 2032 elections. During about half of the upcoming decades, California would have one less vote, if it allows the 355,192 people in northernmost California to become a part of Idaho. We regard this as insignificant compared to 538 votes.

The proposed border keeps the Willamette watershed in Oregon. In Oregon, the new border follows watershed boundaries except for in Deschutes County. The city of Bend remains in Oregon, along with its reservoirs and the West side of the Deschutes river.

States commonly sign interstate agreements allotting each state a portion of the water available from a river. Breach of the agreement is handled in the federal court system. California is already a party to such an agreement for the Colorado River. Water quotas could be included in the interstate compact to move the borders.
The wilderness in the departing counties is almost entirely federal land, so state law won't affect nature much there.
3) Harmony and civility: The groups of counties changing to another state in this proposal voted very heavily for Trump. Their departure will reduce the partisanship in Oregon and California. There is a popular secession movement in these states. County governments in these counties have approved “gun sanctuary county” resolutions expressing their will to defy any more gun control from the state and refuse to enforce new gun laws. More gun control is surely coming now that progressives have more control in the legislature. Allowing these counties to leave reduces the chance of unrest and makes these states more harmonious ideologically. The map below was made June 2018. The green counties had already passed the ordinance, and the yellow counties were committed to voting on it. Efforts were underway to get a vote in the orange counties.
4) Vote count: The Oregon House of Representatives is 63% Democrat. Democrats would be expected to be in favor of this proposal if they don’t live in the departing counties. There are 46 districts entirely within the counties that are not departing. 36 of these are held by Democrats. Also, 12 districts are almost entirely within the boundaries of the departing counties, and 11 of these are held by Republicans. There are 60 districts in the house. A coalition of northwestern Democrats and southern/eastern Republicans could give this proposal 47 out of 60 votes. Even if 10 out of 11 of the southern/eastern Oregon Republicans vote for this proposal, and 21 out of 36 northwestern Democrats vote for this (58%), the proposal would pass with 31 out of 60 votes.

The Oregon Senate is 60% Democrat. 22 of 30 districts are almost entirely within the counties that are not departing. 16 of these are held by Democrats. Also, 6 districts are almost entirely within the boundaries of the departing counties, and 5 of these are held by Republicans. Therefore, we would expect to get 21/30 votes. Even if all 5 southern/eastern Oregon Republicans vote for this proposal, and only 11 out of 16 northwestern Democrats vote for this (69%), the proposal would pass with 16 out of 30 votes. Southern/eastern legislators would have a bright future as legislators for Idaho after the border is revised. The number of state legislative districts can be reduced in Oregon to keep state legislators’ districts stable, or the size of the districts can be reduced, to give citizens more voice. Districts are revised after every census anyway.

In the California Assembly, most of district 1 is covered by this proposal, and it is always held by a Republican. The departing counties form small parts of only two other districts. Democrats have 61 out of 80 Assembly seats (76%). With the 1st district vote, only 40 Democrat votes would be needed (66% of the Democratic Caucus).

In the California State Senate, each senator supposedly “represents” an unbelievable large number of people: one million. Our departing counties form small parts of three districts, but not a significant part of any. The senate district covering the northeastern corner of California, District 1, is represented by Republican Brian Dahle, and he is a Lassen County Republican loyal to the departing counties. Democrats have 29 out of 40 Senate seats (73%). With Rep Dahle’s vote, only 20 Democrat votes would be needed (69% of the Democratic Caucus).
Why the Idaho Legislature is Likely to Approve This Border Revision

We have chatted with someone who had asked the current Idaho governor and Attorney General whether they would be willing to annex counties of eastern Oregon into Idaho. The governor and Attorney General said that they wouldn't say no, but it would have to be initiated by Oregon. They weren’t interested in publicly endorsing it at the moment, but they were willing to sign!

1) **Financial:** This proposal makes the tax base of Idaho broader by increasing the land area of the state and increasing the population by 71%. If mining in one area declines, it may be increasing in another area.

The economy of southern/eastern Oregon and northernmost California would improve very dramatically under Idaho law, regulations, and courts. These areas are mountains and arid highlands, just like Idaho. Idaho law and governmental focus is suitable to mining, logging, and agriculture, and it is business-friendly. As the economy improves, incomes and employment would increase, so that these areas would pay more than their share of Greater Idaho’s tax burden.

This proposal would bring thousands of jobs to Idaho’s capitol city, and to the locations of Idaho’s public universities and colleges. The state government would gain economies of scale, as
the population would increase by 71% to 2.9 million, making it almost half the population of the average US state. The Idaho public university system would gain Oregon Institute of Technology - Klamath Falls, Eastern Oregon University, and Southern Oregon University.

Coal and natural gas industries in the Rocky Mountains have an incentive to support this movement because state laws in Oregon, Washington, and California prevent the construction of a coal/natural gas port needed for export to Asia.

If Idaho’s legislature is unconvinced, county governments in Oregon & California could offer to pay Idaho for the privilege of joining the state.

2) **Political:** 80% of Idaho state legislators are Republican. The Trump vote of Greater Idaho would have been 60.3%, whereas Idaho only gave Trump 59.3%.

Idaho would have the satisfaction of freeing 1.2 million people from blue state law.

The Idaho Legislature currently has only 70 representatives and 35 senators. This number could be expanded so that the districts in Idaho would not need to be redrawn.

3) **Sovereignty:** Idaho would no longer be a land-locked state, which could allow it to gain more political autonomy in the future. The increase in population from the aforementioned counties would make Idaho more self-sufficient.

A recent Reuters poll shows that one third of Americans expect civil war in America within the next five years. No one knows the future, but everyone knows that political structures don’t last forever. Indeed, only three empires or countries in history have managed to maintain the allegiance of more people than the USA has.

It is unlikely that red states and blue states would choose to remain in the same federation after a crisis. It is possible that blue states and red states of America will part ways to provide a peaceful end to the culture wars. In this case, Idaho’s access to the Pacific via Columbia River locks would be dependent on good relations with a foreign country. This imperils the shipment of Idaho’s wheat crop and many other bulk products, reducing the independence of action of the state. Having ports on the Pacific would reduce the cost of such a crisis.

Texas may secede from the Union. A 2016 Reuters poll showed that more Texans were in favor of secession than opposed to secession. If Texas secedes, the USA will never have another conservative president. On the other hand, if Texas does not secede, federal law will continue to force Texas to accept immigration that will turn it into a blue state within a decade. Either way,
the USA will never have another conservative president after Trump. Texas’ poll is analyzed here: www.facebook.com/notes/peaceful-red-state-secession/unreported-2017-reuters-poll-shows-states-ready-to-secede/391466311426359

Giving Idaho ports on the Pacific (particularly Reedsport, Coos Bay, and Crescent City) gives Idaho the option of self-determination if independence becomes expedient in the future. These ports could be deepened, but Coos Bay already has a MLLW (mean lower low water) depth of 37 feet and can handle ships 500 feet in length. Reedsport has a MLLW depth of 15 feet. Also, the locks on the Columbia River up to Lewiston, Idaho have a minimum depth of 15 feet.

Utah and other states could join Idaho in a federation if Idaho secedes first. If Idaho chooses, it could possibly accept all red states into a new federation, as they are all contiguous (except Alaska).

Idaho autonomy is bolstered by the fact that it gets much of its power from hydropower, which is immune to embargo. It is also self-sufficient in food production. It has a border with another country. Of course, Idaho would continue to trade with the US after secession.

Much more information on secession from the Union is available at https://RedStateSecession.org

Why Southern and Eastern Oregon and Northernmost California want Liberation

1) The economy of these counties would improve freed of state regulations, unfunded mandates, and taxes, as Idaho is more business friendly and suitable to rural areas. Idaho has more pro-work welfare programs that preserve state finances.

   Cost of living would decrease because Idaho has less demanding laws and regulations on home building and businesses. According to the Missouri Dep. of Economic Development, Oregon’s 2018 cost of living was 39% higher than Idaho’s. California’s was 47% higher. Red states have lower costs of living. Although Oregon’s average personal income is higher than Idaho’s, dividing by cost of living shows that Oregon’s standard of living is lower. Idaho’s standard of living per person is $44,401 and Oregon’s is $36,690. www.missourieconomy.org/indicators/cost_of_living/ (retrieved summer 2019)
Taxes would decrease. According to WalletHub.com, in 2018 Idahoans paid 7.75% of their income in state and local income, sales, and property taxes, while Oregonians paid 8.25% and Californians 9.47%. These taxes amounted to $3242 per Idahoan, $3971 per Oregonian, and $5663 per Californian. Oregon is increasing taxes in 2019. The red counties don't want the big-spending welfare state that Salem forces on them. They will be happy to have state spending like Idaho's.
Wages would increase. For the 97% of wage earners who make more than minimum wage, wages are set by supply and demand for labor in the local area. Demand for labor would increase because Idaho’s law and regulations are more conducive to business and hiring.

People are concerned about the fate of marijuana farmers in southern Oregon should state lines be moved. The reality is that most marijuana farmers in Oregon have given up on making a profit, and have stopped planting marijuana. Most have turned to hemp, which is not used as a drug but purely as a fiber. As of 2019, Idaho’s House has already passed a bill to legalize CBD and hemp, and the bill may become law this year.

2) The improved economy and the gun rights (being more conducive to rural living) would increase the value of land as more people would want to move in.
3) These areas agree with Idaho on culture-war issues and policy issues. As the philosophy of the Left has unmoored itself from Biblical morality, it will continue to move farther and farther from tradition, following trends of psychology wherever they lead. These areas have given up on winning Oregon state-wide elections, as the last Republican governor was elected 37 years ago, in 1982. Idaho is one of the 4 most conservative states in the country, judging by the last two presidential elections. 80% of the Idaho Legislature is Republican.

4) These areas would have a bigger voice in a state with smaller population. Oregon has 4.1 million people, California has 40 million, but southern Oregon plus Idaho would be 2.6 million. If California allows counties to leave, Greater Idaho would have 2.9 million. California senators represent one million people, Oregon senators represent 138,000, whereas an Idaho senator represents 49,000.

Idaho will certainly undo the Democrat bias gerrymandered into the state legislative districts in southern and eastern Oregon.

5) If these counties became a part of a red state, liberals would be less likely to move there and conservatives would be more likely to move there.

We don’t endorse the idea of trying to create a 51st state out of California because we believe the state legislature of California would not allow it under present conditions (because they don’t want to add two Republican US Senators to the US Senate), but the following map shows how strongly northern California supported the Jefferson secession movement:
In our Facebook poll, 84% of 1300 voters were in favor of our proposal:

POLL: State legislators need to know if you want your area to become a part of Idaho.

Borders between states have been changed or redefined many times in US history. If a deal were made that both state legislatures pass, it would almost certainly become a reality. According to a peer-reviewed law journal, “Prior to 1921, 36 compacts between states were put into effect with the consent of Congress; virtually all of these settled boundaries between contiguous states.”

The majority party in the Oregon legislature is expected to be willing to let “Trump-voting, low-income counties” to leave the state.

Most people in these green areas prefer Idaho law on the guns, the environment, and cultural issues.

If you live in the area of Oregon or California that we marked green, make your choice by clicking on the map that you prefer (this is a poll).

Here’s the group for keeping up to date on the effort to make this a reality: www.facebook.com/groups/GreaterIdaho

We need your activism to make this happen!

Follow this Facebook link for details: www.facebook.com/notes/peaceful-red-state-secession/southern-and-eastern-oregon-and-northernmost-california-can-become-a-part-of-ida/434594537103536

This poll has ended.

13K Votes

9,880 People Reached 3,862 Engagements

67 Likes 102 Comments 210 Shares

www.GreaterIdaho.org
Oregon and Idaho have a common origin. They were a part of the same US territory from 1848 until Oregon became a state in 1859. Before that, they were both a part of the same independent nation, called the Provisional Government of Oregon, from 1841-1848. It was divided into four districts as shown.


Idaho was on the Oregon trail.
How Southern Oregon and Northernmost California Counties Would Pay Their Share of the State Debt

Since the per capita debt of the state government of California is $11,680, and of Oregon is $7574, the government of each departing county would take on its per capita share of its state debt as a part of this deal. However, because they would be as responsible as any other Idahoan for Idaho’s $3133 per capita debt in the future after joining Idaho, Idaho would compensate the government of each county $3133 per capita. California counties would be left with a debt of $11680 – 3133 = $8547 per capita (Oregon counties $7574 – 3133 = $4441) which could be paid off with the issuance of county bonds, which could be paid off with a temporary county tax.

The cost of $8547 or $4441 should not be seen as a cost of switching governments. It is an already-existing debt that they would eventually have to pay even if they remain in their current states.

The $3133 per capita cost to the State of Idaho is not really a loss to the State of Idaho, because the new Idahoan would become obligated to help pay for Idaho’s pre-existing debt ($3133 per capita) in return, along with other Idahoans.
How We Chose Counties

Oregon

The counties we included are Baker, Coos, Crook, Curry, Douglas, Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Jackson, Josephine, Klamath, Lake, Malheur, Morrow, Sherman, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, and Wheeler. We also included portions of Wasco, Jefferson, and Deschutes counties as shown below.
Greater Idaho includes everything in Wasco County east of the Deschutes River plus the City of Maupin.

Greater Idaho (will no longer be Wasco County)
We didn’t include Trump-voting counties or areas that were less conservative than Idaho unless they were located in the middle of counties that were more conservative than Idaho. We believe
this strategy is necessary to increase the chances that the Idaho Legislature will accept this proposal.

All of the Oregon counties included in Greater Idaho that are east of the Cascade Range are more conservative than Idaho except Umatilla County. Averaged together, this group of counties east of the mountains gave 69.3% of its vote to Trump, whereas Idaho gave 59.3% to Trump. By including southwestern Oregon, Idaho would no longer be landlocked.

Counties are creations of the state and, historically, have often been split by acts of state legislatures. Legally, no approval from the counties involved is necessary.

What about Bend and The Dalles?

If you live near Greater Idaho’s boundaries, this proposal gives you the option of moving a few miles to experience freedom of Idaho law. And it gives you access to commute to work in the improving economy in Greater Idaho.

In order for the whole group of counties to be accepted by the majority party of the Idaho Legislature, we have to offer a group of counties that won’t weaken the very strong position of the Republican Party of Idaho. Bend, Warm Springs Reservation, and The Dalles would weaken that position because they don’t vote as Republican as Idaho does, even though Republicans usually win elections in their counties.
California

Modoc and Lassen, in the northeastern corner of California are far more conservative than Idaho. They are dependent on state spending, as more than one thousand citizens work at a state prison there, out of a population of 40,000 (which includes 3100 prisoners). Taken alone as a group, their population is too small to warrant a border change.

Next to them are two counties are Shasta and Tehama, which contain Redding, at the northern end of California’s Central Valley. The northern tips of Plumas and Butte County should be included to improve connectivity between Tehama and Lassen counties. Siskiyou County should
be added since it is sandwiched in between Shasta County and Oregon. In that case, adding Del Norte County would add to Idaho another significant ocean port directly accessible by highway.

The six counties mentioned above, as a group, voted 63.4% for Trump, whereas Idaho voted 59.3%. Their per capita personal income (BEA PCPI) in 2017 was $43,518, compared to Idaho’s $41,826. The average annual income of Idaho state employees, per Idaho resident, is $1056. For these 6 counties, the same statistic is $1680, which is $624 higher. One might wrongly argue that these counties only have an adequate income because California state spending is higher there than Idaho state spending would be. But when averaged over 6 counties, the extra state spending is unnecessary because even if the extra $624 is subtracted from the region’s PCPI, the region still has more than Idaho’s average income. Anyway, it would be expected that Greater Idaho would choose to use the prisons for Greater Idaho’s inmates, as the population of Idaho is growing rapidly, and more prisons will be needed. If not, perhaps California could continue to operate the prisons, and continue to pay these wages.

The precinct-level detail in the map below of Trump’s election results shows that the southern portion of Del Norte is better off remaining in California, as is the precinct next to it in Siskiyou. The red precinct to the south of that is probably unpopulated as it is the slope of a national forest. Also, the southernmost tail of Lassen County should remain with California for compactness. A highway there runs East-West, and Californians shouldn’t have to pass through Idaho to get to Nevada there. The area is unpopulated anyway.

Implementation of this Proposal:

The first phase is to move the Idaho/Oregon state border. The second phase is to move the new Idaho/California state border. Since there is no Idaho/California border at the moment, Phase 2 cannot begin until Phase 1 is complete.

There are two paths to implementation of Phase 1. We need to build the size of this movement either way. Path 1 is someone convinces Oregon state leadership (Willamette Valley Democrats) that this proposal benefits them and their constituency, and then they negotiate a deal with Idaho and pass appropriate legislation.

Path 2 is a state ballot initiative in Oregon, followed by a legislation passed in Idaho, followed by a plebiscite (vote) in Oregon. The draft of the state ballot initiative, if approved, will cause any Idaho legislation to go into effect if approved by a plebiscite (vote) of Oregonians one year after
the initiative is approved. If Idaho passes legislation that is acceptable to Oregonian voters, the border change becomes law in Oregon without the need for approval from Oregon politicians, according to the text of our state initiative.

Unlike Oregon and California, Idaho’s borders are defined by state constitution. Either path requires Idaho to amend its state constitution. This is accomplished by a 2/3 vote in both houses of the Idaho Legislature. Finally, any interstate compact requires the consent of Congress.

Either path requires that we show that rural Oregonians are motivated and favor this proposal. Our organization called “Greater Idaho” is preparing to file citizen’s initiatives to put a question about moving state borders on the 2020 ballot in several Oregon counties. The purpose of this ballot question is to prove that the voters of these Oregon counties want the border moved. A county initiative provides momentum for Path 1 and Path 2.

Next Steps

If we get enough valid signatures on our official petition for a county, Greater Idaho will be on the Nov 3, 2020 ballot in that county. We need volunteers to collect signatures for our county ballot initiatives. Join “Greater Idaho”: www.facebook.com/groups/GreaterIdaho and visit our website www.GreaterIdaho.org Send us your email address to get on our mailing list. Mention "Greater Idaho" in your request. Our email address is: secession@runbox.com

To collect signatures, join a local group:

Move Oregon's Border: Northern Oregon www.facebook.com/groups/MoveOregonsBorderNorth
Move Oregon's Border: Klamath La Pine Lake Harney Malheur www.facebook.com/groups/MoveOregonsBorderKlamath
Move Oregon's Border: Jackson County www.facebook.com/groups/MoveOregonsBorderJackson
Move Oregon's Border: Coos Douglas Counties www.facebook.com/groups/MoveOregonsBorderDouglas
Move Oregon's Border: Josephine Curry County www.facebook.com/groups/MoveOregonsBorderJoCo
We also need donors so that we can pay to get an argument in favor of these county ballot initiatives into voter pamphlets.

Ask your county Board of Commissioners to put our question on their ballot by “referral” so that we don’t have to gather signatures in your county to force it onto the ballot. Send them a link to this proposal: www.greateridaho.org/the_downloads/2019/main/Greater_Idaho_Proposal.pdf

The following is a model that your county commissioners could use:
Share the message of this proposal by creating memes and sharing in Facebook, Facebook groups, and Instagram. This is important because legislators tend to follow public opinion rather than leading public opinion.

You can attend county fairs and other public events to publicize this with a sign, a t-shirt, brochures, or even a table. You can purchase our decal and bumper stickers for your car.

Next, contact Republican state legislators in southern and eastern Oregon and ask them to read this proposal and then explain it to the Democrat state leadership. Call them, send Facebook messages, email them, and ask to meet with them. You can contact more than just your own legislators. We hope that Oregon Democrat state leadership will hear about this proposal, appreciate it, and then reach out to Idaho state leadership to negotiate an interstate compact. If they negotiate a deal, they can introduce a bill in each legislature and pass it. Obviously Oregon and Idaho have to agree before California can take action.
Contacting any Democrat state legislator in Oregon might help get this idea to Oregon state leadership. Contacting Idaho legislators could help too, if Idaho leadership is willing to reach out to Oregon leadership about this.

Send them a link to this proposal: www.greateridaho.org/the_downloads/2019/main/Greater_Idaho_Proposal.pdf

Let us know by private message what legislators say to you about the idea.

Find your legislator (but reach out to others too):

Oregon: https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/FindYourLegislator/leg-districts.html

Idaho: https://legislature.idaho.gov/legislators/whosmylegislator/

California: www.legislature.ca.gov/legislators_and_districts/legislators/your_legislator.html
Call Oregon reps using this phone list:
https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/house/Pages/RepresentativesDistrict.aspx

Oregon Republican Representatives in departing counties:
Rep.DavidBrockSmith@oregonlegislature.gov; Rep.GaryLeif@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.CarlWilson@oregonlegislature.gov; Rep.DuaneStark@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.KimWallan@oregonlegislature.gov; Rep.CedricHayden@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.MikeMcLane@oregonlegislature.gov; Rep.EWernerReschke@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.GregSmith@oregonlegislature.gov; Rep.GregBarreto@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.DanielBonham@oregonlegislature.gov; Rep.LynnFindley@oregonlegislature.gov

Oregon Republican Senators in departing counties:
Sen.HermanBaertschiger@oregonlegislature.gov; Sen.DennisLinthicum@oregonlegislature.gov;
Sen.BillHansell@oregonlegislature.gov; Sen.CliffBentz@oregonlegislature.gov;
Sen.DallasHeard@oregonlegislature.gov
Oregon Democrat Representatives in remaining counties:
Rep.PaulHolvey@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.CaddyMcKeown@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.DavidGomberg@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.MartyWilde@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.JohnLively@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.NancyNathanson@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.JulieFahey@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.DanRayfield@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.PaulEvans@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.BrianClem@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.TeresaAlonsoLeon@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.CourtneyNeron@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.SheriSchouten@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.JeffBarker@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.SusanMclain@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.JaneenSollman@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.BradWitt@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.TiffinyMitchell@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.MitchGreenlick@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.KenHelm@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.MargaretDoherty@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.JenniferWilliamson@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.RachelPrusak@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.AndreaSalinas@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.MarkMeek@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.KarinPower@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.TinaNosse@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.TawnaSanchez@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.AlissaKenyGuyer@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.DiegoHernandez@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.JeffReardon@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.ChrisGorsek@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.CarlaPiluso@oregonlegislature.gov;Rep.JanelleBynum@oregonlegislature.gov;
Rep.AnnaWilliams@oregonlegislature.gov

Oregon Democrat Senators in remaining counties:
Sen.FloydProzanski@oregonlegislature.gov;Sen.ArnieRoblan@oregonlegislature.gov;
Sen.LeeBeyer@oregonlegislature.gov;Sen.JamesManning@oregonlegislature.gov;
Sen.SaraGelser@oregonlegislature.gov;Sen.PeterCourtney@oregonlegislature.gov;
Sen.MarkHass@oregonlegislature.gov;Sen.ChuckRiley@oregonlegislature.gov;
Sen.BetsyJohnson@oregonlegislature.gov;Sen.ElizabethSteinerHayward@oregonlegislature.gov;
Sen.GinnyBurdick@oregonlegislature.gov;Sen.RobWagner@oregonlegislature.gov;
Sen.KathleenTaylor@oregonlegislature.gov;Sen.LewFrederick@oregonlegislature.gov;
Sen.MichaelDembrow@oregonlegislature.gov;Sen.ShemiaFagan@oregonlegislature.gov;
Sen.LaurieMonnesAnderson@oregonlegislature.gov

Oregon Senate leadership: www.oregonlegislature.gov/senatedemocrats/Pages/leadership.aspx

Oregon House leadership:
House Speaker Tina Kotek Democrat - District 44 - N/NE Portland
Capitol Phone: 503-986-1200    District Phone: 503-286-0558
Capitol Address: 900 Court St. NE, Rm. 269 Salem, Oregon 97301
Washington State Should Become One State Consisting of Two Districts

Although the Washington state legislature would not be willing to give US Senate seats to a new state, it would benefit from an idea that was introduced as a bill for New York. The Washington Constitution could be revised so that Washington would remain a single state for federal elections, but two states for state and local issues. Each district would have its own governor, legislature, law, taxes, budget, and courts. There would be no governance at the state level, only at the district level and below (except to define congressional district boundaries and other minor tasks in coordinating with the federal government).

Democrats in the current legislature would vote for this because Washington would be glad to have low-income Trump-voting counties out of their budgets and out of their district elections. This proposal doesn’t prevent the later creation of a new state, it just bides time until conditions change to make that more likely to be approved. And creating district autonomy could be a stepping stone to statehood.


Join our group for splitting Washington here: [www.facebook.com/groups/SplitWashington](http://www.facebook.com/groups/SplitWashington)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>Trump Vo</th>
<th>Hillary Votes16 CI</th>
<th>Trump %</th>
<th>Hillary ratio</th>
<th>Personal Income Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA)</th>
<th>cost of living</th>
<th>standard of living</th>
<th>state and local tax as % of total state wallet of pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>presidential</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1.45e+07</td>
<td>4483810</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>39536653</td>
<td>59796</td>
<td>5,663</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remainder of CA</td>
<td>1.45e+07</td>
<td>4389793</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>39181461</td>
<td>59944</td>
<td>59944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2001536</td>
<td>782403</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>4142776</td>
<td>48137</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>36690</td>
<td>3,971</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Oregon</td>
<td>1593344</td>
<td>534342</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>3287155</td>
<td>50006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>690225</td>
<td>409055</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>41826</td>
<td>$4,401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Idaho</td>
<td>1246570</td>
<td>751133</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>2927756</td>
<td>41777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3317019</td>
<td>1221747</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>7405743</td>
<td>57896</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>41742</td>
<td>$4,747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S/E OR</td>
<td>407992</td>
<td>248061</td>
<td>124115</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>855621</td>
<td>41248</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker County, Oregon</td>
<td>8779</td>
<td>6218</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>16054</td>
<td>39026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coos County, Oregon</td>
<td>31032</td>
<td>17865</td>
<td>10167</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>63888</td>
<td>41802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crook County, Oregon</td>
<td>12172</td>
<td>8511</td>
<td>2637</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>25712</td>
<td>38366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry County, Oregon</td>
<td>12611</td>
<td>7212</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>22669</td>
<td>41099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Deschutes (Redmond)</td>
<td>23049</td>
<td>17514</td>
<td>5536</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>48900</td>
<td>50955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County, Oregon</td>
<td>55521</td>
<td>34582</td>
<td>14096</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>109405</td>
<td>38752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam County, Oregon</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>47614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County, Oregon</td>
<td>4340</td>
<td>3210</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>7190</td>
<td>39797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harney County, Oregon</td>
<td>3974</td>
<td>2912</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>7289</td>
<td>38177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson County, Oregon</td>
<td>109327</td>
<td>53870</td>
<td>44447</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>217479</td>
<td>44360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County plus 6 county</td>
<td>8318</td>
<td>5540</td>
<td>2514</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>21600</td>
<td>31543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine County, Oregon</td>
<td>44560</td>
<td>26923</td>
<td>13453</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>86352</td>
<td>38896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath County, Oregon</td>
<td>30507</td>
<td>20435</td>
<td>7210</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>66935</td>
<td>38446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County, Oregon</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>3022</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>7863</td>
<td>38091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur County, Oregon</td>
<td>10435</td>
<td>7194</td>
<td>2246</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>30480</td>
<td>30231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow County, Oregon</td>
<td>4167</td>
<td>2721</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>11166</td>
<td>40309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman County, Oregon</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>48609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla County, Oregon</td>
<td>27082</td>
<td>17059</td>
<td>7673</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>76985</td>
<td>37964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union County, Oregon</td>
<td>12968</td>
<td>8431</td>
<td>3249</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>26222</td>
<td>38301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallowa County, Oregon</td>
<td>4366</td>
<td>2848</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>7051</td>
<td>42926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler County, Oregon</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>34414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 county</td>
<td>148323</td>
<td>94017</td>
<td>42930</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>355192</td>
<td>43518</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>31376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modoc County, California</td>
<td>3788</td>
<td>2696</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>8859</td>
<td>45338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen County, California</td>
<td>10524</td>
<td>7574</td>
<td>2224</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>31158</td>
<td>40759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehama County, California</td>
<td>23908</td>
<td>15494</td>
<td>6809</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>63926</td>
<td>40016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta County, California</td>
<td>80053</td>
<td>51778</td>
<td>22301</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>179921</td>
<td>44691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte County, California</td>
<td>9558</td>
<td>5134</td>
<td>3485</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>27470</td>
<td>39990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskiyou County, California</td>
<td>20492</td>
<td>11341</td>
<td>7234</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>43853</td>
<td>43735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus a small amount of Plumas</td>
<td>S/E OR</td>
<td>556315</td>
<td>342078</td>
<td>167045</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1210813</td>
<td>41707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID + S/E OR</td>
<td>1098247</td>
<td>657116</td>
<td>3130880</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>2572564</td>
<td>41536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diff from Idaho</td>
<td>407992</td>
<td>248061</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>855621</td>
<td>-290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% compared to Idaho</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To obtain the spreadsheet, email secession@runbox.com
The image below shows where Oregon prisons are located. The data above was adjusted so that Southern Oregon was not penalized for having more than its share of prisoners without income. The cost of living of these prisoners is covered by the state, and most of them come from the big cities. As mentioned above, prisoners from northwestern Oregon are the financial responsibility of northwestern Oregon.
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