

Submitter: Jim Strong  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: Senate Committee On Labor and Business  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB1569

I am opposed to expanding the definition of police officers for the sole purpose of sweetening the retirement benefits of non-sworn civilian employees & union members. Seemingly every month we read about the deficit & debts of the public retirement system yet some legislators are supportive of increasing the costs of public pensions, agency contributions, debt of the system, etc all for the convenience of garnering votes & campaign contributions of a larger union base. Police officers are & should be a distinct class of retirement system members. The proposed changes in eligibility for civilian ancillary & support staff are inappropriate, costly, and wrong for a state gov't which consistently wants to raise taxes, costs of goods, and otherwise penalize the general public. According to the 2025 ACFR Oregon already faces a long term debt of \$28 billion in its public pension system. It makes absolutely no sense to needlessly add to that in the form of this bill.